

IN THE ARMY APPOINTMENTS

Appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Philip A. Brummit, O4012893.
Gerald H. Buchanan, O1883064.
Otis L. Cox, O2104898.
Herbert F. Hardy, Jr.
Robert H. Maxson, Jr.
Melvin E. Meister, O4017142.
Raymond R. Stommel, O4017181.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1954, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Ludgero S. A. Gomez, Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1954, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Kenneth N. Adams	John A. Mooneyham
Robert W. Altland	William E. Mullin
James H. Anderson	Maurice R. Norton
Peter B. Ashby	Salvatore W. Nunziata
Donald M. Babers	William G. O'Leary
John S. Bace	Leonard E. Pacha
William R. Bailey	Don L. Parker
Martin A. Ball	Henry A. Passarelli, Jr.
Richard A. Baum	Clarence A. Patnode, Jr.
Earl K. Beck	Vincent T. Pellegrino
Gary R. Bill	James W. Poarch, O4000232
William C. Boden	Jake H. Privette
William C. Bradley	Robert J. Richards
Joseph P. Burn	Eduardo deJesus Rivera
John C. Burnett	Thomas G. Salyers
William F. Burns	Jewel W. Satterfield
Jose Collazo, O1888834	Herbert J. Scholz, Jr.
Terence C. Corning	Robert J. Schwarz
Henry G. Davis	Joseph R. Scott
Ubaldo del Toro	Donald D. Screen
Thomas F. Des Champs	Peter B. SeEVERS
James W. Dillon	Leonard W. Sloan
Robert F. Dunn	Robert J. Smith
Patrick L. Feore, Jr.	James E. Stallard III
Daniel J. Fischer	Ben W. Stutts
Edward J. Fisher III	Gerson J. Subotky
William F. FitzPatrick	John R. Travis
John J. Fossett	Norman H. Ulmer, Jr.
James D. Fraher	Joseph J. Vuono
Santiago A. Garcia	Francis J. Walter, Jr.
George R. Giles	Robert T. Willey
Ellis H. Hamlett	Charles A. Williams
Richard E. Hauck	Raymond F. Yost
Joseph P. Keene	Raymond H. Young
George S. Kepner	Andrew T. Zahn
Glenn Kohler	
Robert H. McHaney	
John A. Milani	

The following-named person for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of 1st lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

Margaret M. Griffith, N792520.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Jay A. Abercrombie and 3,963 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were received by the Senate on June 14, 1954, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jay A. Abercrombie, appearing on page 8156, and ending with the name of James E. Wittek, shown on page 8171.

C—570

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be lieutenant colonel, United States Air Force (Medical)

James G. Langford, AO1695919.

To be majors, United States Air Force (Medical)

William W. Hart, AO2260322.
Stephen J. Rudolph, Jr., AO1745442.
Charles A. Veatch, AO985586.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

Harry R. Bratt, AO725668.
Paul W. Musgrave, AO2213196.
Leland E. Noll, AO2241254.
Robert B. W. Smith, AO1906192.
Arthur E. Weigel, AO965881.
Robert W. Zellmer, AO2240851.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Dental)

Harrison J. Hannon, O989536.
Lester W. Raab, AO2213611.
William D. Riley, Jr., AO1906273.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical)

Charles H. Bausman, Jr., AO3000126.
John M. Connolly, AO1893355.
Perry F. Crawford.
William F. Denny.
David H. Draper, AO2240369.
William C. Finlay.
John D. Gallagher.
Dudley B. Houle.
Kelvin D. Kable, AO779152.
Robert H. Lang, AO2261395.
Gerald H. Mahaffey, AO759483.
Frank L. Mahan, AO2261364.
Martin N. Malachowsky.
William G. Malette, AO941288.
Glenn D. Moak, AO2261044.
Marvin G. Newby, AO2261431.
Theodore W. Richey, AO2261204.
Hubert W. Smoak, Jr.
James H. Stuteville, AO650945.
Ernest H. Teagle.
James M. Thompson, AO840425.
David A. Turner, AO2240399.
James R. Upp, AO2261698.
Raymond O. Waters, AO789222.
Frederick W. Wiese, AO389846.
David F. Wolter, AO755615.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Dental)

Burton C. Bickford, AO2060768.
Norman C. Gadbois, AO2067981.
Charles A. Jenkins, Jr., AO2260108.
Edward G. Johnson, AO1906573.
William L. Keefer, Jr., O1892536.
Edward F. Miller, AO814521.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Shuford M. Alexander, Jr., AO692627.
Donald W. Bennett, AO1860268.
Paul A. Butler, AO1912333.
Vincent S. Cahill, Jr., AO2061216.
Robert J. DeLacy, AO1860572.
William L. Evans, Jr., AO1849666.
Galen C. Fox, AO1860681.

Arnold Friedman, AO1910867.
William F. Goeken, AO2070971.
Daniel E. Guidice, AO2090989.
Joseph R. Guth, AO2078528.
Laird Guttersten, AO942028.
Spencer Hall, Jr., AO774137.
Clayton L. Henderson, AO714084.
Stephen B. Hicks, AO1856707.
Frank S. Hussey, Jr., AO719665.
Joubert S. McCrea, Jr., AO713834.
Gabriel C. Olsen, AO1857355.
John A. Powers, AO671590.
Everett E. Pritchard, Jr., AO1846844.
Channing L. Purdy, AO837973.
LaVern G. Reilly, AO1855094.
Jack E. Shinn, AO785901.
William H. Shivar, AO707337.
George M. Simpson, AO1846959.
Charles O. Smith, AO2221786.
Lloyd E. Sunderland, AO757401.
William C. Watts, AO72235.
Willard C. Wiggins, Jr., AO841880.
Earl L. Willems, AO1866080.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations of Eugene Halle Callahan and 410 other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were received by the Senate on June 16, 1954, and which appear in full in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Eugene Halle Callahan, appearing on page 8356, and ending with the name of Bruce Allan Butcher which is shown on page 8357.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, in this brief moment of prayer, may we enter into a closer and more intimate fellowship with Thy Spirit, the source of light and power, of joy and peace.

Give us the faith, the wisdom, and the strength to discharge our duties faithfully and meet our difficulties and disappointments bravely and patiently.

Grant that, as we go in and out among our fellow men, we may carry with us a hopeful and helpful spirit which will inspire them with indomitable courage and unflinching trust.

Make us more conscious of our responsibility to bring comfort and cheer to the brokenhearted and the weary who are staggering under heavy burdens.

May we daily cultivate an attitude of sympathy and understanding toward the feelings and needs of all who have seen their fondest dreams and cherished plans go down in defeat before the inroads of circumstances over which they have had no control.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 24, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House

is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9447. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3385. An act to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 119. An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma; and

S. 2217. An act to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9517. An act making appropriations for the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CASE, Mr. HILL, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. MAGNUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9474. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8873) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 2, 5, 13, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 35 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3378) entitled "An act to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CORDON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. LONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54-16.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WILSON of Indiana, VURSELL, HUNTER, NORRELL, and FERNANDEZ.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1955 (H. R. 9517).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION BILL, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Idaho? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BUDGE, JENSEN, TABER, CLEVELAND, FOGARTY, FERNANDEZ, and CANNON.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1926)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 21, 23, 43, 51, 59, 60, and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 30, 34, 36, 39, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50, 55, 57, 62, and 66, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,765,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$23,314,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$6,250,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be used for personal services and not more than \$750,000 shall be used for travel expenses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,913,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$59,547,215"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,881,245"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$3,800,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be available for personal services: *Provided further*,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$126,637,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That, during the current fiscal year, not more than \$26,000,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be available for personal services and not more than

\$1,000,000 shall be available for travel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,257,222"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,098,390"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,084,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,301,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$3,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment insert "Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty-seven passenger motor vehicles (including one at not to exceed \$2,750) of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, and the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 54, and 58.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
MICHAEL J. KIRWIN,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GUY CORDON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$140,000 instead of \$125,000 as proposed by the House and \$150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,765,000 instead of \$625,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,337,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount recommended by the conference committee, \$1,140,000 is for the purpose of implementing "interim" contracts between the Southwestern Power Administration and certain generating and transmitting cooperatives in the area. Its expenditure is limited to March 1, 1955, unless permanent contracts have been completed by that time. The committee urgently insists that permanent contracts be completed between the Southwestern Power

Administration, the rural electric generating and transmitting cooperatives, and private electrical utilities in the area at the earliest possible date, so that this appropriation for "interim" contracts will be sufficient to carry through the period of both contract negotiations and construction of necessary physical connections.

The committee further recognizes that certain lawsuits are now pending in regard to the right of the Federal Government to purchase electric power and energy from steam plants built by generating and transmitting cooperatives with funds borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration for resale by it to others, and the right of the Federal Government to lease, in their entirety, certain transmission systems constructed with Rural Electrification funds, and ultimately to purchase same. Therefore, the action of the conference committee, in making the above recommendations, is not intended to prejudice the validity of said contracts between Southwestern Power Administration and the various rural-electric cooperatives, nor deemed to be congressional interpretation of applicable law.

Research in the Utilization of Saline Water

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$255,000 as proposed by the House.

Oil and Gas Division

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$250,000 instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency Flood and Storm Repairs

Amendment No. 5: Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$23,314,000 instead of \$18,915,000 as proposed by the House and \$26,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The program of the Senate as set forth on pages 8 and 9 of the Senate report is approved with the following changes:

Item No. 108—Chief Joseph-Snohomish, Nos. 3 and 4	\$4,300,000
116—The Dalles area service	1,300,000
136 — McNary - Walla Walla	300,000
150—System reactive facilities	1,026,000
840—Preliminary engineering studies	0

It is the intent of the conferees that sufficient funds shall be available for constructing the transmission lines needed for transmitting Chief Joseph power as soon as the scheduled generating units are ready to operate. The funds provided are to be applied in such a manner as to complete the Chief Joseph line No. 4 to Sultan and Covington at the earliest practical date and the Chief Joseph line No. 3 on such a schedule as will provide a proper outlet for Chief Joseph power.

The conferees on the part of both Houses agree that some flexibility may be desirable in application of the construction funds provided and that adjustments in the amount programmed for the various activities may be made but not to exceed on any item the Senate figure as set out in the Senate report.

Amendment No. 8: Restores House language limiting the amounts to be available for personal services and travel expenses, and sets these amounts at \$6,250,000 and \$750,000, respectively, instead of \$6,000,000 and \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$6,200,000 instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Management of Lands and Resources

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$11,913,000 instead of \$11,483,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,413,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of both Houses endorse the statement in the House report to the effect that \$100,000 is to be used specifically for pellet and/or conventional airplane seeding. Of the amount appropriated \$650,000 is to be used for control of halogeton.

Construction

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$2,500,000 instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Strikes out language which would have made appropriations for operation and maintenance of access roads on the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands a reimbursable charge against the Oregon & California land-grant fund. The managers on the part of both Houses are in agreement that these costs should be made reimbursable but not until firm budget estimates for the amounts involved can be developed. Separate estimates and justifications for this purpose are to be supplied in connection with the 1956 budget.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 13: Strikes out language not needed in view of the action taken on amendment No. 12.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Health, Education, and Welfare Services

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$59,547,215 instead of \$52,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House figure includes funds for 150 additional beds in contract hospitals for tubercular Navajo and Hopi Indians. Of the total amount allowed \$80,000 is for 20 additional beds at the Methodist Hospital at Seward, Alaska.

Included also in the increase above the House figure is \$5,514,680 for the emergency education program for Navajo children and for continuation of the Fort Totten and Rosebud boarding schools, and \$1,000,000 for an adult vocational training program. In connection with this training program the conferees agree that the Pipestone school in Minnesota should be considered for operation as a facility for both white and Indian pupils and to be jointly financed by the State and Federal Governments.

Amendment No. 15: Strikes House language limiting the amount to be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Resources Management

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$12,881,245 instead of \$12,592,910 as proposed by the House and \$13,169,580 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 17: Restores House language limiting the amount of funds available for personal services and sets this limit at \$3,800,000 instead of \$3,500,000 as was proposed by the House.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,875,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21: Appropriate \$3,350,000 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,559,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$2,750,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 from the Colorado River development fund.

000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 from the Colorado River development fund.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Appropriate \$126,637,000 instead of \$114,479,700 as proposed by the House and \$132,977,127 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$55,626,197 shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

The program of the Senate set forth on page 15 of the Senate report is approved with three exceptions as follows:

Solano project, California	\$7,000,000
Transmission division, Missouri	
River Basin project	12,000,000
Missouri River Basin investigations	2,220,000

The funds provided may be adjusted as necessary by the Secretary to accomplish this program but not more than Senate figure as adjusted herein is to be used on any project or item.

With reference to the funds provided for the All-American Canal project, the committee has been advised that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Division of Highways of the State of California are presently negotiating in an effort to agree on a less expensive structure for the Mecca-Blythe Highway crossing on the Coachella division. The conferees believe it would be in the best interests of the State and Federal Governments that a more economical alternative be worked out by mutual agreement and that such plan or plans be submitted to the two Appropriations Committees for their approval before any of the construction funds available for this purpose are expended.

With respect to the Central Valley project of California, the conferees agree that no funds appropriated in this bill shall be used for construction on the Trinity River project. Funds have been made available for preliminary investigations for this project under the "General investigations" appropriation. With regard to certain of the power-sales contracts on the Central Valley project, it is the view of the conferees that upon completion of the study of the matter directed by the conferees in the report on the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1954, the Secretary should make his findings and take such action with respect to the matter as consistent therewith.

The funds provided for the Solano project in California are to be used to the extent needed to complete purchase of land and land rights in the reservoir areas.

The conferees on the part of both Houses have agreed that the use of funds programmed for the transmission division of the Missouri River Basin project shall be limited to projects and items covered in the budget estimate. The conferees direct that a study be made looking toward the feasibility of substituting a 230-kilovolt transmission line from the most advantageous point on the Bureau grid system in South Dakota to a point in Nebraska near the State line, in lieu of the 115-kilovolt line from Gavins Point Dam into Nebraska for which funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1954.

None of the funds provided for investigations in the Missouri River Basin area are to be used on the Missouri diversion unit until it has been demonstrated to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses that the majority of the people on the unit want to proceed with it.

With respect to development farms on irrigation projects, there is some doubt in the minds of the conferees on the part of both Houses as to whether this is a proper activity for the Bureau of Reclamation. The managers on the part of both Houses urge the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to give this matter immediate attention, with the view in mind of present-

ing a sound development farm program in the budget for the fiscal year 1956. Funds provided in the bill may continue to be used for the fiscal year 1955 for the operation of existing development farms.

Amendment No. 24: Restores the House language limiting the amounts available for personal services and for travel expenses and sets these limits at \$26,000,000 and \$1,000,000, respectively, instead of \$24,000,000 and \$800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 30: Strikes out House language, as proposed by the Senate, prohibiting use of funds for construction of the Glendo Unit.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: Appropriate \$21,500,000 instead of \$19,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,154,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that of this amount \$18,257,222 shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$4,000,000 instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 34: Inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing the purchase of one aircraft.

Geological Survey

Surveys, Investigations, and Research

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$25,735,000 instead of \$25,362,655 as proposed by the House and \$25,860,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Strikes House language, as proposed by the Senate, requiring that the expenditure of funds for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings for the Geological Survey be subject to the enactment of lease-purchase or other authorizing legislation.

Bureau of Mines

Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$13,500,000 instead of \$12,564,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,650,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed \$55,000 is to be used for completion of the mine-flood studies in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania and for preparation of final reports on this study.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate \$1,000,000 instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate, and strike House language limiting funds for regional offices as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that the reduction of \$250,000 in the budget estimate is to be applied to the amount programmed for regional offices.

National Park Service

Management and Protection

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$9,098,390 instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed \$9,000 is for the Coronado National Memorial in Arizona, \$50,000 is for the soil and moisture conservation program, and \$500,000 is for the park and recreation programs activity. No other specific changes have been made in the amounts programmed for activities under this heading.

Maintenance and Rehabilitation of Physical Facilities

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$8,425,000 instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,850,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided \$86,500 is to be used for the purpose of keeping the

road from Narada Falls to Paradise Valley in Mount Rainier National Park open for winter use.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out House language, as proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of funds for the maintenance of roads other than national parkways outside the boundaries of the national parks and monuments. The managers on the part of both Houses are in accord with the purpose of such a provision but wish to allow the Secretary time to effectuate arrangements with the States involved for assuming maintenance of such approach roads wherever such arrangements are practical. The managers on the part of both Houses require a report of accomplishments in this connection at the time of the 1956 budget presentation.

Construction

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$8,056,099 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,512,099 as proposed by the Senate. The specific amounts agreed upon by the conferees for certain items in the program are as follows:

Natchez Trace Parkway.....	\$256,899
Black Hills areas, Mount Rushmore.....	250,000
Roosevelt Island.....	50,000
Isle Royale.....	175,000
Colonial National Park.....	40,000
Carlsbad Caverns.....	375,000
Coronado National Memorial.....	56,000
International Peace Gardens.....	25,000

Funds for the Colonial National Park include \$15,000 for investigation of the structural soundness of the Yorktown Victory Monument shaft by a competent engineer or engineering firm, and for rehabilitation of the structure if this is found to be practicable from the standpoint of making it a safe support for a new figure at the top.

Of the funds provided for the Carlsbad Caverns, \$250,000 is for the construction of a public-use building to be completed within the amount allowed. The unexpended balance of the amount provided under the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1953, for a portion of the cost of constructing an airport near Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., is to be programmed for construction of a usable unit of the Administration-Public Information Building in Grand Canyon National Park.

In connection with both appropriated and donated funds available for acquisition of lands within the boundaries of areas administered by the Park Service, no land is to be taken through the condemnation procedure where the use of such procedure is objected to by the owner.

The conferees on the part of both Houses have agreed that the possibility of transferring full responsibility for parkway construction to the Bureau of Public Roads should be explored. A report on this subject will be expected at the time of the hearings on the 1956 budget.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$1,084,000 instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Strikes out House language, as proposed by the Senate, limiting the amount of funds to be available for payment of personal services in regional offices. The managers on the part of both Houses endorse the statement in the Senate report concerning regional offices.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Management of Resources

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$6,301,000 instead of \$6,137,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,465,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount appropriated, \$2,700,000 is to be used for the activity "Propagation and distribution of food fishes" and \$10,000

is to be used for the control of blackbirds in New Jersey.

The managers on the part of both Houses insist that funds from permanent appropriations, such as the revenue from duck stamps, are not to be used for any activities other than those specifically authorized by the laws establishing the permanent appropriations.

Amendment No. 47: Strikes out House language, as proposed by the Senate, limiting the amounts available for personal services and travel.

Investigations of Resources

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Appropriate \$4,127,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,027,000 as proposed by the House and earmark \$350,000 for the lamprey eel program instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House. Of this amount, \$20,000 is to be used for reconstruction of raceways at the Craig Brook, Maine, hatchery, and \$35,000 is to be used for improvement and repairs at the Inks Dam hatchery near Burnette, Tex.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$725,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 52: Authorizes the purchase of 5 aircraft for replacement only instead of 3 as proposed by the House and 6 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Territories

Administration of Territories

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$3,400,000 instead of \$3,234,471 as proposed by the House and \$3,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Amendment No. 54: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska Public Works

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction of Roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$8,000,000 instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,940,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and Maintenance of Roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction Alaska Railroad

Amendment No. 58: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60: Limit the amounts to be paid the General Manager and one Assistant General Manager of the railroad at \$13,000 and \$11,000, respectively, as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,000 and \$12,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Virgin Islands Public Works

Amendment No. 61: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate appropriating \$885,000 for the Virgin Islands Public Works Program.

Administration, Department of the Interior

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates \$2,330,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

General provisions

Amendment No. 63: Provides for the purchase of 227 passenger motor vehicles of which 200 are for replacement only instead

of the purchase of 627 automobiles of which 600 were for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Limits funds available for information activities to \$200,000 instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION
Grants

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$510,000 instead of \$439,924 as proposed by the House and \$682,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided \$350,000 is to cover operating deficits of the Corporation.

TITLE V—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS
Bureau of Reclamation

Amendment No. 66: Strikes out House language, as proposed by the Senate, rescinding funds appropriated in previous years for the Coachella division of the All-American Canal.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 3, line 13, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$2,469,000, to be derived by transfer from other appropriations made in this act in the sums and in the manner set forth in Senate Report No. 1506, 83d Congress, and in addition, not to exceed \$100,000 shall be transferred from other accounts and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$2,469,000, to be derived by transfer from other appropriations made in this act in the sums and in the manner set forth in Senate Report No. 1506, 83d Congress, and in addition, not to exceed \$100,000 shall be transferred from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior and made a part of this appropriation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 54 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 12, line 25, insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$53,000 shall be available toward the emergency rehabilitation of the Avondale

irrigation project, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 13, line 3, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$297,000 shall be available toward the emergency rehabilitation of the Crescent Lake Dam project, Oregon, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 13, line 7, insert the following: "Provided further, That sums made available for increasing spillway capacity at Alamogordo Dam, Carlsbad project, New Mexico, for the purpose of removing the existing flood hazard, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 13, line 11, insert the following: "Provided further, That the unexpended funds appropriated for Savage Rapids Dam rehabilitation in Public Law 470, 82d Congress, second session, shall be available for rehabilitation of appurtenant canal protective works."

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 13, line 15, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$45,000 of the unexpended funds heretofore appropriated for the Jamestown unit (North Dakota), Missouri River Basin project, shall be available for public use and safety facilities at said unit."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 30, line 13, insert the following:

"TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Public Law 204, 80th Congress, including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the trust territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such trust territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 34): *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, 80th Congress."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 54.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Line 32, page 20, strike out "\$7,494,000" and insert "\$5,400,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 58, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,900,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table:

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask to return to Senate amendment No. 6.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that the gentleman's request comes too late.

H. R. 8680, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT
APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 243.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In connection with Senate amendment No. 7, insert \$24,314,000 instead of \$23,314,000 as recommended in report of the committee on conference.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENT CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION, PHILADELPHIA

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 256) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, Philadelphia, Pa., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, to be held at Philadelphia, Pa., from September 13 to September 25, 1954, inclusive, by the Instrument Society of America, a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at such exposition, upon which there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

Sec. 2. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of such exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for

herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. All such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law.

Sec. 3. Imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States.

Sec. 4. At any time within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the United States or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted.

Sec. 5. Articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at such exposition, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

Sec. 6. The Instrument Society of America, a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act. The actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charge for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the Instrument Society of America, a corporation, to the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1524).

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. It has long been the policy of the Congress to facilitate the participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The First International Instrument Congress and Exposition is to be held

at Philadelphia, Pa., from September 13 to September 25, 1954, inclusive, by the Instrument Society of America, a corporation.

The joint resolution provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The language of the resolution is patterned on language approved in earlier legislation providing for the free importation of goods for display at other expositions or world fairs.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON STATE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 537) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, to be held at Seattle, Wash., from March 11 to March 25, 1955, inclusive, by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the

general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, shall be reimbursed by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1524).

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. It has long been the policy of the Congress to facilitate the participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair is to be held at Seattle, Wash., from March 11 to March 25, 1955, inclusive, by the International Trade Fair, Inc. This corporation, in the interest of greater international collaboration in the interchange of newly developed products, will assemble a number of products from the Far East for the purpose of educating the American people concerning these items.

The joint resolution provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the

United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The language of the resolution is identical in terms with that approved in earlier legislation providing for the free importation of goods for display at other expositions or world fairs.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE-SAMPLE FAIR, DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 545) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade-Sample Fair, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade-Sample Fair to be held at Dallas, Tex., in 1955, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at such fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of such fair to sell within the area of such fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on any articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of such fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such articles shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment

of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at such fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Trade-Sample Fair shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, and the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisal, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, shall be reimbursed by the International Trade-Sample Fair to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1524).

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. It has long been the policy of the Congress to facilitate the participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The joint resolution provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the fair, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The language of the resolution is patterned on language approved in earlier legislation providing for the free importation of goods for display at other expositions or world fairs.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND PARAGRAPH 1539 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 WITH RESPECT TO FOOTWEAR

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6465) to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff

Act of 1930 with respect to footwear, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1934, as amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'For the purposes of this paragraph and any existing or future proclamation of the President relating thereto, footwear of which a major portion, in area, of the basic wearing surface of the outer soles (that part of the article, not including the heel, that is designed to be the basic wearing surface and to resist wear on contact with any surface) is composed of india rubber or any substitute for rubber, or both, shall be deemed to have soles wholly or in chief value of india rubber or substitutes for rubber.' The foregoing amendment shall enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the passage of this act."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House bill was intended to close an apparent loophole in the tariff laws which permits foreign producers to insert a leather filler in rubber footwear and thus escape the duty applicable to such footwear. The Senate amendment has two purposes:

First, it limits the change in classification to rubber-soled footwear with fabric uppers such as tennis shoes, sneakers, and so forth. This, of course, was the original purpose of the House bill.

Second. The Senate amendment provides an opportunity up to 180 days to effect modification or termination of any international obligations with which the bill might conflict. The Departments of State and Treasury originally objected to the bill but have withdrawn their objections in view of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7709) to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "1956" and insert "1955." Amend the title so as to read: "An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment simply provides for a 1-year suspension of the copper

duty instead of the 2-year suspension voted by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING THE ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3378) to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DEWART, SAYLOR, BERRY, ENGLE, and BENTSEN.

CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3318) to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Permit me to state that I have consulted both the majority and minority leaders on this bill and it is reported unanimously by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to the authority of Public Law 204, 80th Congress, approved July 18, 1947, the President approved a trusteeship agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands between the United States Government and the Security Council of the United Nations; and

Whereas responsibility for civil administration of the trust territory was vested in the Secretary of the Navy by Executive Order No. 9875 of July 18, 1947; and

Whereas responsibility for such administration was transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, effective July 1, 1951, by Executive Order No. 10265 of June 29, 1951, as amended by Executive Order No. 10408 of November 10, 1952, and Executive Order No. 10470 of July 17, 1953: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That until Congress shall further provide for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, all executive, legislative, and judicial authority necessary for the civil administration of the trust territory shall continue to be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner and through such agency or agencies as the President of the United States may direct or authorize.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of \$7,500,000 per year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar House bill (H. R. 8754) be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Harold E. Talbott, announced that the Air Force Academy would be located at Colorado Springs, Colo. I am, indeed, proud and happy to have the Academy located in Colorado, and in my district.

The selection of Colorado Springs as the site for the Academy was made after a most exhaustive and comprehensive investigation of all of the places mentioned as possible sites. I understand that in the beginning there were some 400 of these sites being checked.

Several years ago a board reduced the number under consideration to seven, and at that time Colorado Springs was one of the cities on the list. However, no action was taken on this report.

Under the terms of Public Law 325, 83d Congress, we authorized the Air Force Academy for the first time. The Secretary of Air was instructed to appoint a commission consisting of five members to recommend a site. Under this bill, the Secretary was required to designate the site recommended by the commission if the recommendation was unanimous. The commission failed to agree on a site, but did recommend three, as provided under the terms of the law. This left the responsibility on the Secretary to name the site. After personally visiting all three of the sites and checking on every possible detail, the Secretary made his announcement that the Academy would be placed near Colorado Springs.

I fully realize that there are many fine sites in this country for the Air Academy. Those of you who have visited Colorado Springs will, I am sure, understand why the Secretary decided on Colorado as the site for the Academy, and why Colorado Springs has always received favorable consideration as the most desirable location for the Academy.

We are fully aware of the heavy responsibilities we must assume in seeing that the boys attending this Academy have the finest possible environment in which to build character and develop to the fullest their minds and bodies. We intend to discharge this obligation to the very best of our ability. The entire State of Colorado recognizes this responsibility and intends to cooperate to the fullest extent in making these boys feel at home in our midst.

I feel confident that the boys you appoint to the Air Academy are going to enjoy their 4 years in Colorado Springs. They will find a most friendly people, who will welcome every opportunity to assist them. There are many scenic attractions in and near Colorado Springs which will be of great interest and pleasure to these boys.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Secretary will never have reason to regret his decision in placing the Air Academy in Colorado. Our people have already set high standards for hospitality and cooperation with the military that will be fully maintained. We are proud of the fact that we have been selected for this important assignment, and we know you will also be proud of the Academy when it is completed.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HEARINGS IN SEATTLE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this body know, the House Un-American Activities Committee recently visited the west coast and held hearings in my district in Seattle.

Prior community support of the hearings, as evidenced by some 350 letters and telegrams of support from various organizations and labor unions, indicated the attitude of the public and foreshadowed the success of the hearings. The members of the press, radio, and television contributed greatly to its effectiveness. Subsequently, I have received a great many letters from constituents, and I am pleased to advise the House of the extremely favorable public reaction to this congressional investigation. As might have been expected, however, the King County chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action issued a statement that this hearing "deserved neither admiration nor respect."

Attempts to discredit the committee as partisan were promptly dispelled by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], who issued a clear statement which certainly added to public understanding. The fairness, patience, and dignity exhibited by the chairman and members of the subcommittee were most favorably recognized.

Of course, it was a great shock to those who wrote me to discover the extent of Communist Party membership and the devious manner in which this menace from within has operated.

Emphatically, my constituents have impressed upon me their concern lest this foreign-controlled plot to overthrow our constitutional government be aided and abetted by dupes and coddlers. I know, thanks to House committee investigations such as this, that the legislative branch of our Government can enact laws within the framework and protection of due process which will allow the executive branch to meet the Communist threat.

Surely no one doubts that with proper laws, President Eisenhower and the other officials of the executive branch can cope with the threat posed by the web of subversion this administration inherited.

I compliment the House Un-American Activities Committee on its fair and effective investigations in Seattle.

RESOLUTIONS TO INVESTIGATE HATE PROPAGANDA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on two resolutions I introduced today dealing with hate propaganda against religious and racial groups being sent through the mails.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two resolutions dealing with hate literature against religious and minority groups now being transmitted in large quantities through the mails. While our attention is being held by the effort to expose Communists and subversives and root them out of key positions, the lunatic fringe on the right-wing is having a field day. The deep current concern of the country with congressional investigations of communism and subversion and the protest against the excesses in such investigation appear to be giving hatemongers and bigots the opportunity they have sought to parade their anti-Protestant, anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic, and anti-Negro material through the mails under the guise of participation in the anti-Communist struggle. The vicious material going through the mails originates abroad and in the United States.

One of the resolutions is a resolution of inquiry asking the Postmaster General to give the answers to the following questions:

First. Are the mails being used for the purpose of disseminating false and defamatory statements as to depravity, criminality, lack of virtue, or lack of patriotism attributed to citizens as a class of any race, color, creed, religion, or national origin?

Second. Are the mails being used for the purpose of disseminating such material seeking to overthrow by force or subversion the constitutional government of the United States?

Third. Is such material going through the mails from outside the United States to destinations within the United States?

Fourth. Are the laws of the United States relating to the transmission of such material adequate to prevent its being transmitted and distributed through the mails within the United States?

Fifth. What measures does the Postmaster General recommend be taken by the Congress in order to make the laws adequate to bar such material from the mails?

The second resolution calls for an investigation to be made by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the use of the mails for the pur-

pose of disseminating false and defamatory statements as to the depravity, criminality, lack of virtue, or lack of patriotism attributed to citizens as a class of any race, color, creed, religion, or national origin.

For example, one of the most virulent of these publications, anti-Semitic in nature, recently transmitted, I understand, in a number of about 500,000 through the United States mails, originated and is marked as originating in Norrviken, Sweden. It is an old-fashioned hate document carried through the mails and widely distributed within the United States. There are regular publications published in various States and going through the mails which carry this vicious propaganda as a regular thing. This and other examples of similar material may be inspected at my office.

The Supreme Court has held in the case of *Beauharnais* against Illinois, decided on April 28, 1952, that the distribution of material exposing the citizens of any race, color, or religion, to contempt, derision, or obloquy can be made a criminal offense. We are and properly so very partial to free speech and free expression but this does not mean that we should not define criminal libel for what it is or that we should not prohibit the use of the mails to incitement to such hatred and division as to threaten the very foundations of our country. My resolutions propose that the Postmaster General give us the facts and that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service investigate. I am confident that with the facts in hand the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will give the matter its early and deserved attention.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BE- GINNING OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the firing of 2 shots by a political maniac—5,000 miles from our shores that involved us in 2 world wars and cost the lives of over half a million Americans. Forty years ago today Woodrow Wilson was the President of the United States. We were a peaceful and a happy people, pursuing the ways of peace and believing that at last this old world of ours had reached the end of the century-long road of man's destruction of his fellow man on battlefields. Then came the firing of these two shots. The dream was ended; history had taken another turn. Mr. Speaker, the dream of the American people 40 years ago is still the dream of the American people. The realization of that dream, the end of war and the bringing of the permanent peace, is the challenge that this generation in this Nation under God must, and will, achieve.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in order that my position may be known on legislation reflected by the following rollcalls, I should like to be recorded as having voted "yea" on rollcall Nos. 3, 15, and 17; "nay" on rollcall No. 21; "yea" on rollcall Nos. 25, 29, 41, 43, 47, 51, 52, 66, 69; and "nay" on rollcall Nos. 70, 72, and 74.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLU- TION SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, June 24, 1954, he did on June 25, 1954, sign the following enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3476. An act to provide for the advancement of Comdr. Donald B. MacMillan, United States Naval Reserve, retired, to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list.

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Abbitt	Fulton	Martin
Albert	Garnatz	Mason
Angell	Granahan	Meador
Barden	Grant	Morrow
Barrett	Green	Miller, Md.
Battle	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Beamer	Hale	Miller, N. Y.
Becker	Harden	Morgan
Bonin	Eays, Ohio	Morrison
Bosch	Heller	Murray
Buchanan	Herlong	Norblad
Burdick	Hillings	O'Brien, N. Y.
Busbey	Hinshaw	Osmer
Byrne, Penn.	Horan	Perkins
Camp	James	Pfost
Canfield	Kean	Phillips
Chatham	Kearns	Phillips
Chudoff	Kersten, Wis.	Pillion
Cooley	Kluczynski	Powell
Cobbett	Krueger	Radwan
Cotton	Lantaff	Regan
Coudert	Latham	Riley
Curtis, Mo.	LeCompte	Robison, Ky.
Curtis, Nebr.	Lesinski	St. George
Davis, Ga.	Long	Scott
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Small
Dingell	Lyle	Sutton
Dodd	McConnell	Taylor
Dorn, N. Y.	McCulloch	Vursell
Fallon	McIntire	Wainwright
Feighan	Machrowicz	Welch
Fernandez	Madden	Williams, Miss.
Frelinghuysen	Magnuson	Wilson, Tex.
Friedel	Maillard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce that the Republican conference which was to be held this afternoon has been postponed until further notice.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATORY TOLLS ON INTERSTATE TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower stood here in the House last January 7 and told us:

The American economy is one of the wonders of the world. It undergirds our international position, our military security, and the standard of living of every citizen. This administration is determined to keep our economy strong and to keep it growing.

I want to speak briefly today about a very real and serious threat to our economy which has been raised in some of

the States and then to propose a remedy which is open to us here in the Congress.

This threat is the erection of barriers against the free flow of interstate commerce in the form of ton-mile, weight-distance, axle-mile, and similar third-structure highway use taxes being levied by some States over and above motor fuel taxes and registration fees. These taxes amount to discriminatory tolls on interstate truck transportation and they menace the strong and growing economy that the President is pledged to maintain. These discriminatory tolls are imposed on trucks traveling in interstate commerce over highways built with Federal-aid dollars in contravention of Mr. Eisenhower's stated aims and of the long established policy of Congress to promote the free and healthy flow of commerce among the States.

These discriminatory taxes literally make toll roads out of public roads for certain classes of vehicles. They are far different from the tolls imposed on some of our new superhighways, built without Federal-aid funds, where the motorist pays a fee which he recovers in the form of better gasoline mileage, more expeditious travel, and less wear and tear on the vehicle.

Freedom of movement among the States was one of the underlying principles in the formation of our Union. The States themselves historically have made an effort to preserve this freedom of movement. Highway transportation has become an increasingly vital factor in our overall economy and a key reason why it has grown in importance year by year has been the cooperative attitude of the States in allowing the free movement of motor vehicles.

The ability to produce, and the ability to distribute that which is produced, are the twin foundations of this country's high standard of living and its high rank among the powers of the world.

The importance of our ability to produce is etched indelibly in the minds of all of us. In the mind of many Americans, in fact, production is a one-word explanation of this country's great power. They believe, with the late Wendell L. Willkie, that "only the productive can be strong, and only the strong can be free." Americans, therefore, view with interest anything that may enhance our ability to produce, and view with concern anything which might impair that ability.

Although production without distribution is worthless, the importance of distribution does not appear to be so clearly appreciated, and threats to the continued efficiency of our distribution system do not arouse the attention which they deserve.

It is our distribution system, the greatest in the world, which has made the United States one big market place for all the good things produced by all our farms and factories. In some countries—much smaller countries—people actually starve in some sections while there is plenty in other sections, simply because there is no way of getting to them the things they need.

Here in our Nation it does not matter who you are or where you live, that which

is available for any of us is available to all of us, and at approximately the same price.

Our great American railroads, our airlines, our water carriers, our pipelines—all of these are parts of our distribution system. The other vital part, with which I am seriously concerned, is highway transportation. In a relatively short span of years, America literally has become a Nation which moves on rubber-tired wheels.

Highway transportation of both people and goods has become an integral and indispensable part of the American economy, the American way of life. Moreover, our highways and the millions of vehicles that roll over them are essential to the defense and survival of this Nation.

In my judgment, third-structure highway use taxes threaten to retard seriously, if not destroy, substantial segments of highway transportation. These taxes, or discriminatory tolls, imposed by some States place heavy burdens upon the interstate movement of commercial motor vehicles, leading to retaliatory actions by other States. Unless these developments are thwarted now, in their earlier stages, we could well see a virtual breakdown of interstate commerce by motor vehicles, and a resultant increase in transportation costs and the cost of living.

In the early days of the automobile, a number of States required any vehicle operating in the State to have a license plate issued by that State. Such actions brought movement of automobiles between States almost to a standstill. The situation was chaotic, so the States worked out agreements among themselves to solve the problem.

These reciprocity agreements simply embrace the Golden Rule and a good neighbor policy. Under their terms, one State simply says to another: "If you do not require automobiles from our State to be licensed in your State, we will not require automobiles from your State to be licensed in our State." It was as simple as that, and by 1928 every State in the Union was a party to what had become a nationwide agreement.

Until recently a substantially similar reciprocity program has prevailed with respect to the interstate movement of motor trucks.

Motor vehicle reciprocity has made possible the tremendous growth of the entire automotive industry. Reciprocity has been a key factor in bringing about the tremendous growth of our rubber, oil, and other related industries which figure so prominently in our whole economy.

Reciprocity has made possible the increasingly free movement of people and goods all over the country, and such movement has contributed immeasurably to our social and economic welfare.

The reciprocity agreements under which freight-carrying motor vehicles operate are today in serious jeopardy because a limited number of States have seen fit to take unilateral actions which violate the agreements through the imposition of discriminatory tolls in the form of third-structure highway use taxes.

These States have not violated the agreement by requiring trucks from other States to purchase additional license plates. They have done it by enacting laws requiring trucks from other States to pay special mileage taxes which frequently exceed, on an annual basis, the cost of a license plate.

These actions by a few States, these clear and deliberate violations of the reciprocity principles which have enabled the United States to grow and prosper, naturally are resented bitterly by other States which believe in these principles and want to live up to the agreements.

Some States have moved quickly with retaliatory actions against the violating States. They can scarcely be blamed for replying in kind. Other States have shown more restraint and are waiting hopefully to see if the matter cannot be resolved amicably.

In the meantime, interstate truck operation is being seriously damaged. For-hire trucking companies have been bankrupted in some instances. Other firms have been forced to move to other States in order to remain in business. Many more are struggling to survive as pawns in a game of border warfare that is reminiscent of the Balkan States of Europe.

Tempers have flared, personalities have become involved, and the situation is getting worse instead of better; indeed, it has become so serious as to threaten some of the basic and fundamental principles upon which the National Government was founded. It is a situation which demands the urgent attention of the Congress of the United States.

For a great many years Congress has recognized the importance of an adequate and efficient system of interstate highway transportation. This recognition has been reflected in large appropriations granted to the States on a matching basis to aid in the construction and improvement of an adequate highway system.

The 1952 Federal Aid Highway Act—providing for fiscal 1954 and 1955—included the first specific appropriation for the national system of interstate highways in the amount of \$25 million annually. The 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act increased the amount for this specific purpose to \$175 million annually—an increase of 700 percent. Further, the 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act, for the first time since Federal motor fuel taxes were levied, appropriated road funds in an amount equal to or in excess of collections from these taxes. In the 20 previous years, the Federal Government had diverted one half of the total \$9 billion collected in motor fuel taxes to the general purposes of government.

The total amount of Federal highway aid also has just been substantially increased. Whereas the appropriations for fiscal 1954 and 1955 were \$575 million annually, the appropriations for fiscal 1956 and 1957 are \$875 million annually. The increase alone makes money available to the individual States in amounts which exceed the revenues derived by certain States from the special controversial discriminatory toll

levies which a few of them are assessing.

Thus, as President Eisenhower has said:

The Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal highway aid program.

It is getting its appropriations and its procedures in good order. On the other hand, the Federal efforts to promote the general welfare and provide for the national defense by developing a good network of interstate highways knitting our States together into a strong union are being obstructed by the aforementioned artificial barriers to the unhampered movement of interstate commerce.

Now, there is something which Congress has every right to do—something which, in my opinion, it is duty-bound to do, to help correct this situation.

The Federal highway aid program since its inception as a full-scale activity in 1916 has carried with it certain limitations on the States use of federally granted moneys for highway aid. These limitations are in basic recognition of the necessity of the States conforming to prescribed qualifications in order that the purpose of Federal highway aid will be fulfilled.

The initial requirement of importance was contained in the original act of 1916. It provided that each State, to share in the appropriations, must first establish a State highway department adequate in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, under whom the first Federal Aid Act was administered.

The act of 1921 contained a prohibition against the use of Federal moneys for the construction of toll roads.

The Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, an amendment to the Federal Aid Act, contained a provision directed against diversion by the States of highway taxes to nonhighway purposes.

These and similar restrictions clearly establish both the right and the duty of Congress to qualify its grants-in-aid to assure that the congressional objectives will be fulfilled.

I believe we now need another amendment to the Federal Aid Road Act, an amendment designed to discourage and neutralize the type of artificial barriers I have described.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill to withhold from the highway funds apportioned to any State which imposes ton-mile, weight distance, axle-mile, or other such third-structure highway use taxes, over and above motor fuel taxes and registration fees, an amount equal to the State's collection of such taxes during the year preceding the year for which Federal aid highway funds are authorized.

The bill also provides that any sums so withheld from offending States shall be reapportioned, in accordance with existing formulas of apportionment, to those States which do not impose third-structure taxes.

This legislation in no way infringes States' rights. It merely sets up qualifications for recipients of Federal funds—an accepted procedure. It does not prohibit the imposition of the so-

called third structure or discriminatory toll type of tax, but merely provides that States which raise this barrier against interstate commerce shall not enjoy the same Federal benefits designed to promote the free flow of interstate commerce as States which do not raise such barriers. Further, the courts have held consistently that the States have no right to interfere with congressional efforts to facilitate interstate commerce.

As a matter of fact, qualifications much more stringent than I proposed have been suggested and could be set up for recipient States under the Federal aid highway program without doing violence to States rights.

I hope this measure can receive the earnest and expeditious consideration of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, and that Congress will take a step which is within its power to correct the alarming situation I have described.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT, 1954

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I yield myself such time as I may desire, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 600 making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 9678, a bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 600, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule, waiving points of order with 5 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, when the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee appeared before the Rules Committee the other day, he told us that this bill would authorize the sum of \$3,668,908,000 to be expended for the fiscal year of 1955. This figure was originally \$3,440,608,000, but the additional authorization for future infrastructure installments and an authorization for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency brings the figure up to \$3,668,908,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to bring out at this point that for fiscal year 1953 the amount of \$6,011,000,000 was authorized and in 1954 \$4,726,000,000 was authorized. These reductions, Mr. Speaker, represent a 42-percent cut in the authorizations in 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how extremely difficult it is to predict with any degree of accuracy what the future may hold for the United States. We are living in a world where two diametrically opposed systems and philosophies of government are engaged in what appears may be a prolonged struggle for supremacy. At our meeting in the Rules Committee the other day, the question was asked as to how long it was thought these huge sums of money would have to be expended? It was a fair question. There is not a member sitting here today who does not recognize the fact that the people of the United States have been sacrificing a great deal financially in recent

years in order to maintain the program that we have under discussion today.

When this question was asked at our meeting, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee candidly admitted that he could not tell the members of the Rules Committee when it would be possible to eliminate the program.

We all recognize the unfortunate fact that there are some weaknesses among the allies themselves, as far as concerted action and methods of approach are concerned. The fact that the European Defense Community has not yet been established in Europe and that the Indochina situation is so fluid must of necessity be a matter of grave concern to us all.

However, in spite of these discouraging factors, the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in their report stressed that through this bill they hoped that the United States would be strengthened in her ability to meet the threat of Soviet aggression and that the stability and security of nations in which the United States has airbases and other defense facilities might also be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would also attempt to keep the resources of Western Europe and the free world from falling under Soviet domination and would seek to strengthen our ties of cooperation and friendship with the economically underdeveloped nations of the world.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9678 attempts to eliminate all aspects of the foreign operations program that are not essential to meeting the situation which confronts our country today. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill according to the report is to make provision for only the operations which are essential to present-day United States foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so important insofar as its ramifications are concerned that it is essential that an adequate debate take place on it. I think that 5 hours will give the House enough time for this debate and that the rule itself will enable the House to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will adopt the rule contained in House Resolution 600.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time, not to oppose the rule but, instead, to speak on the pending Mutual Security bill as seriously as I can for a few moments; to speak from my heart and with what little mentality, judgment, and conscience I may have.

I am firmly convinced the time has come, in fact has long passed, when we should make a careful restudy, reappraisal, and reexamination of our entire foreign policy and foreign-aid program.

There are a few facts which we developed in connection with the hearing on this legislation before the Rules Committee that should be of interest to the House as we approach these hours, and perhaps days, when we will discuss and debate this mutual-security program, as

it is now called. It is a part of the general foreign-aid program which has been running on and on, in one form or another, ever since July 1940. I wonder how many of you realize that during the World War II period, from the fiscal year of 1941 through 1945, inclusive, that we gave to foreign countries, peoples, and nations the stupendous total of \$59,869,639,312 in American funds. Every dollar and every penny of this huge amount was actually borrowed money, charged to account of the taxpayers of the United States.

In the postwar period, for all of fiscal years from 1946 through 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1953, we have given away, in one form or another, to the peoples and governments of other countries some \$55,207,451,624.

Since fiscal year 1954 started, or during this fiscal year, up to May 15, we have given to others, in the form of foreign aid, \$4,224,906,564.

This makes a grand total spent on foreign aid of \$119,301,997,500.

These figures come from the Treasury, and have been furnished me by able statisticians. I believe they are absolutely accurate and correct, and cannot be challenged.

In addition to this \$119,301,000,000 we have given aid to other countries through the World Bank and the Monetary Fund to the extent of \$3,385,000,000.

I would also like to point out that in the period of time that we have been furnishing foreign aid to other countries, or since July 1940, the simple interest—not compound, but simple interest—which we have paid on the money we have borrowed to finance our foreign-assistance program alone totals \$18,606,524,210.57 up until May 15 of 1954.

So when we add these figures together we find that in principal and interest on our foreign-assistance programs, in one form or another, have cost the United States since July 1, 1940, the staggering sum of \$131,031,895,964.

Yet, despite the fact that the United States of America has been the most generous, the most open-hearted nation and people in the history of the world, we find that since we started these foreign-aid programs world communism has grown stronger than ever before, so we now have at least 800 million more people under the control and domination of communism than when we started. Yes, we have more enemies and fewer friends in the world today than when we started; and right at this very moment we find, to our sorrow and to our regret, that, perhaps, our leadership in world affairs is not as strong now as it has been. Certainly, we have not received the co-operation and the assistance from others we expected or should be entitled to, in all good common sense. So, it seems to me that perhaps it is time for us to re-examine our foreign policy and our foreign-aid program, and weigh judiciously and solemnly all the evidence which is before us, and determine whether or not these things we have been doing are right and proper and what we may have to do about it.

One other thought I wish to call to your attention: The testimony on this bill before the Committee on Rules the other

day indicates we have somewhere between nine and one-half and ten billion dollars, or will have as of July 1, of unexpended funds in our foreign-aid appropriations carried over, of which anywhere from \$2.5 billion to \$3.5 billion or \$4 billion—according to whom we listen and from whom we get our information—are unobligated today. In other words, we have enough money in the appropriations which have already been made in the past for foreign aid purposes to permit the present foreign-aid program to continue to function at the same level or schedule as for the last few years and run it for more than 2 years without appropriating another dollar.

It seems to me that the suggestion of one of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we delay action on this legislation until we know a little more as to what the future may hold, and what agreements and arrangements may be made in certain conferences now going on in Washington, and what cooperation we may have from other countries, and what solution may be possible to expect in the Indochinese situation—was a very good one. It seems to me that member made a pretty good point, indeed, something which we might well consider.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say something in conclusion, that is not said in any spirit of criticism. It has been suggested that we look at this matter with our souls and our hearts rather than in hard-headed realism. I have tried to do just that. But I am not unmindful, Mr. Speaker, of the fathers and mothers of the boys who fought and died, and of our expenditure of \$500 billion which we poured out in World War II, to help other countries; and of the American blood and money spent in Korea. I am not only thinking of the mothers and fathers, and of the boys who fought and died in these wars of the past but also of those boys whose lives are at stake in the future, and of the mothers and fathers of those who may be called to go into combat again under this present foreign policy. Yes, American mothers and fathers, and even American fighting men, have hearts and souls also. The young men who have been killed in combat—American boys—and those who have been wounded and maimed, were also possessed with hearts and souls.

While we want to cooperate in aid and do all we can to measure up to our responsibility in world affairs, from a commonsense standpoint, if nothing else, it seems to me it is our job as Representatives of the American people, to give just a little thought and attention—yes, even a great deal of thought and attention—to what is really best for the United States of America.

Cooperation Avenue is a wonderful boulevard, but it should be, and it must be, a two-way street, or it will not serve a worthwhile purpose.

So I am urging my colleagues, the Members of the great House of Representatives of the United States, to give this legislation serious and thoughtful consideration, remembering that after all we do represent the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone on both sides of the aisle is familiar with the contents of the rule. I know of no objection to it and I have no requests for time. I join with the gentleman from Illinois in hoping that the rule will be promptly adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9678, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to our beloved and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

THE REALITIES OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are about to begin the discussion and debate on H. R. 9678, the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In my opinion this legislation is vital to the security of the United States. This bill has been carefully studied by your Committee on Foreign Affairs, and will be analyzed carefully during this debate by the membership of the House. But before going into a technical discussion of the provisions of this bill I believe it would be helpful to give serious thought to the realities of the world situation with which we are confronted.

In recent years our foreign policy has expanded to all parts of the globe. It has become a tremendous economic burden not only on ourselves but our allies as well. Since the future of the entire world depends upon its success, it behooves us to constantly keep in mind its primary objectives. The most important of these is to promote the peace and security of the United States. We should never lose sight of the fact that our foreign policy should be inherently for our own self-interest. I believe we can do this, and at the same time cooperate with friendly nations to bring about world peace if it is possible to do so.

The commentators and the press frequently give most of their attention to what the United States does for foreign nations, and what those nations think of United States foreign policy. This would lead one to believe there is an apparent contradiction between such a selfish objective for our foreign policy and the extent to which the Government of the

United States has concerned itself with worldwide problems in recent years.

In my opinion, it is not being inconsistent for us to strive for the achievement of international peace and security so that armed force shall not be used except in the common defense of the free world. The efforts of the United States and other nations to promote peace and security must be based on the principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. Not to do so would expose ourselves to the danger that in following a policy which is necessarily and desirably selfish we devote so much attention to ourselves that we get out of touch with reality.

THE SOVIET THREAT

We are not being realistic and we are not protecting our own security in an admittedly troubled world if we disregard the fact that the Soviet Union constitutes a threat to every man, woman, and child in the United States. It would be a wonderful thing for all of us if this threat did not exist. Our taxes would be lower, our sons would not be drafted, and we could stop worrying about many of the problems of foreign countries which necessarily must be of concern to us now. This has not been a decision of our own making. We wish there were no Soviet threat; we wish that, somehow, the masses of people behind the Iron Curtain could, through some miracle, free themselves now from Kremlin bondage. The realities of international life give us no other choice but to consider the Soviet threat as the No. 1 menace to mankind everywhere, including the United States.

We must face facts as they are and not as we wish them to be. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have access to most of the information which our Government has about Russia. In addition to the frequent meetings which the committee has with the principal officers of the Government, I am invited from time to time to the White House and to the office of the Secretary of State for consultation on problems which arise; also, I have made a study of defenses in many of the NATO countries, as well as having penetrated the Iron Curtain through my visit to Moscow last fall. Nothing I have been able to learn encourages me to believe the present rulers of Soviet Russia are any less hostile to the United States or less intent on bringing the world under Communist domination than was the Stalin regime.

The reality of the Soviet menace does not depend on the accuracy of our reading of the minds of the men in the Kremlin. We know that in Europe the Soviet Union has atomic weapons; we know that the Soviet Union has between 175 and 180 divisions under arms and some 20,000 aircraft; we know the Soviet Union is strengthening the military power of its satellite countries; we know that the present Soviet leaders have been indoctrinated from childhood with the belief that communism must destroy the capitalist world or itself be destroyed; we know that the men who dominate Russia today, in common with all dictators, live in constant fear of their own people. As a consequence, they cannot permit friendly contact between their

people and other nations. It is necessary for the Kremlin to keep the people behind the Iron Curtain in ignorance of conditions in the rest of the world, and saturated with propaganda of foreign enemies in order for them to accept the misery in which they live as being imposed on them by the necessity of preparing for an attack by hostile nations.

Consequently, it is clear to me that the Soviet Union not only constitutes a threat to the United States today, but that its leaders are the victims of forces which prevent them from allowing Russia to become a friendly and peace-loving nation.

The primary problem of United States foreign policy is the protection of the United States from the Soviet threat.

Because of these realities with which we are faced, we must by necessity realize, in order to obtain such common defense for the security and general welfare of the United States that our foreign policy must promote appropriate and necessary steps to facilitate the effective participation of such nations in planning for individual and collective self-defense, including the furnishing of military assistance to such friendly nations and international organizations.

I fully realize there are those who do not agree these steps are necessary to implement our foreign policy. They believe that a continental defense of the United States is entirely possible. They believe that it is possible for us to make a stand behind our ocean barriers and, with the resources available to us, to beat off any attack launched against us. They do not subscribe to the argument that if Europe or Asia or both fall into Soviet hands, the task of United States to defend itself perhaps while not impossible, becomes increasingly more difficult.

I am convinced, however, that continental defense is not the most effective or the cheapest way to defend the United States. It is the sort of thing we should be prepared to do as a last resort, but only after other measures which promise a quicker victory at less suffering and sacrifice to the United States have failed.

There is no doubt that we can spend every cent we now spend abroad to great advantage at home. But can we—dare we—take the risk of doing so?

While at times I have found myself in disagreement with some of the programs included in our foreign policy, I believe our best chance of survival is bound up in some form of collective security. The United States cannot be the sole gladiator to save the world.

MAJOR PROBLEMS CONFRONTING US

If this is so, then, to keep ourselves secure from the Soviet and Red threat the United States is confronted with two major problems. First, the necessary preparation to withstand a military attack; second, the prevention of such an attack, if possible.

The preparation to meet an armed attack is essentially a military matter. Nevertheless, our policy toward and relations with other nations has an important influence on the nature of our military defense.

I am fully in accord with the basic defense concept of President Eisenhower and our military leaders. This concept is based on the theory that the best defense is for the United States to build up the military strength of ourselves and our allies to such a point that we can withstand a military attack. Such a plan makes a network of airbases as close to the borders of Soviet Russia as possible of great strategic value. This concept requires the full use of modern weapons, the construction of which involves the use of rare minerals and other materials which have to be imported from outside the borders of the United States. In furnishing such military assistance we must also exert maximum efforts to achieve control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments so as to lessen the changes of a successful attack against us.

It is difficult for the American people, accustomed as they have always been to the apparently limitless resources of our country, to take a realistic view of the situation we face as regards strategic materials. We depend on foreign sources today for 30 percent of our requirements of copper, lead, and zinc; 50 percent of our requirements of tungsten, bauxite, and antimony; 75 percent of our requirements of chrome and manganese; and all of our requirements of tin and jute. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff are very conscious of these facts and our defense strategy gives full recognition to them.

It is important to our military defense also that as large a portion of the manufacturing facilities, technical skills, and natural resources of the world as possible be kept from coming under Soviet domination. If the steel and electrical industries of Western Germany, Belgium, and France could be added to the production capacity which the Soviet Union already has, the enormous production advantage which the United States has always maintained over the Russians would be gone.

If we want to keep the minerals of Africa, the oil of the Near East, and the factories of Western Europe out of Russian hands, it is desirable that we enlist the help of other nations in defending these distant places. It is not the policy of the United States to defend the steel industry of Lorraine for the sake of France, or the oil of the Persian Gulf for the sake of the Arabs. It is our policy to keep these resources away from the Russians for our own military benefits. It is in the interest of the people of those areas to defend themselves against Soviet aggression and we gain by assisting them to do so effectively.

All of these considerations indicate that a carefully planned and comprehensive military defense plan thrusts the United States into contact with foreign nations and requires us to participate in solving some of their problems.

PREVENTING A SOVIET ATTACK

It is clearly our first duty to prepare ourselves to meet effectively a Soviet attack if it comes. It would be the height of folly to depend entirely on negotiation, political maneuvering, and economic pressure to combat Soviet aggres-

sion with the consequence that should such a policy fail we would inevitably fall under Russian control.

Nevertheless I personally am confident that if we use our ingenuity and our resources and our moral stamina effectively, we can prevent a Soviet attack. I am convinced that United States foreign policy has already succeeded in putting the Communists in a position where it is less advantageous to them to launch world war III than was the case a year ago.

In the first place, we must never forget that self-preservation is the first interest of the men in the Kremlin. They are not patriots striving to improve the welfare of their people or willing to sacrifice their lives for their country. They are tyrants whose first interest is the protection of their skins and their jobs. They are in constant fear of revolt from within. They would never go to war merely in defense of a principle. They would only launch an attack if they were sure they would win.

Furthermore the Soviet leaders prefer subversion to military action. They know better than anyone else in the world how to undermine a government and to impose their control on a nation without resorting to military force. They certainly have no reason to abandon such methods in view of conditions in many nations today.

I feel confident, however, that the United States, by continuing to build up our ability to retaliate against an armed attack and by working zealously to prevent Communist subversion in other nations as well as our own, can make sure that the Soviet leaders will not believe it is to their advantage to launch an attack. Much can be accomplished in this direction by building up better understanding among the free peoples of the world; that through joint organizations we can establish united fronts based on self-help and cooperation better equipped to resist aggression and prevent world war III.

THE NATURE OF FOREIGN AID

President Eisenhower has inaugurated a significant change in our foreign aid policy. Instead of aiding our military allies to build their defenses to be ready for a given date of maximum danger, the policy has been changed in recognition of the fact that we do not face any longer a particular year of peril, but we must face a continuing threat over a period of many years to come. The result is a program of maximum defense at bearable cost.

A military program maintained at a rate that would overtax the economies of either the United States or of our allies would, under present conditions, be self-defeating. It could even be disastrous. I do not believe that the Soviet have established a date in 1954 or 1956, or at any other time on which an attack against the United States will be launched. I do believe, however, that the Soviet will launch an armed attack at any time and any place if they think they can gain a net advantage by doing so. In the meantime, the leaders in the Kremlin will try to turn nation against nation, to subvert from within,

and to do everything possible to weaken the forces which are at present arrayed against them.

There would be no more fertile field for subversion than nations which devote so much of their resources to preparing for a war which does not materialize that the welfare of the common man is lost sight of. On the other hand, it would be even more dangerous for our allies to abandon or drastically curtail their military programs just because they believe that a Soviet attack is not imminent. It is particularly important that the United States keep our own military expenditures, together with aid to our allies, within such limits that our own economic health will be unimpaired.

I feel strongly that our policy toward economic and technical assistance must be reevaluated and redefined. The United States should not give assistance to any nation as charity. I believe that the American people are the most charitable in the world, but I am sure that they want their contributions to be voluntary and not imposed on them by law.

Assistance should only be given to a country if such assistance advances the foreign policy of the United States. No nation is entitled to United States aid as a matter of right. We cannot determine the amount of money which we should give a country by the misery of its people or its lack of development. There are some countries where it is in our interest to spend money for technical assistance. There are others where it is not. We do not have enough money to distribute it according to the needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world, even if such a policy were otherwise desirable.

At the same time, when we consider the basic problem with which our foreign policy is concerned, including our need for airbases, our requirements for strategic materials, and the importance of preventing Soviet conquest by means of subversion, it does not appear to be sound to limit ourselves rigidly as to the types of assistance we will provide. We should set rigid limits on the total funds available and we should clearly define by law the objectives for which assistance is to be given.

We must recognize, however, that our purpose in certain countries may be only to prevent the Soviet from taking over. The government and the people in such instances may not be pro-American. They may be entirely unwilling to commit themselves to an alliance with us or even to identify themselves as anti-Soviet. It may still be in the interest of the United States to provide limited aid to such a nation.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that we should spend large sums on countries which are uncertain as to which side they are on in the present world conflict, and we should not give military aid to any nation that is not willing to join with us wholeheartedly in carrying forward a common effort to meet aggression.

The important thing is that United States foreign policy is completely bound up in the realities of protecting the people of the United States against the Soviet threat. I have tried to give some indication of how complex and how

big the job is. I am sure that some of the critics of our foreign policy are engaging in wishful thinking and are deliberately shutting their eyes to certain very important elements in the situation.

The ultimate decisions rest with the American people. Each person must decide for himself whether or not the Soviet threat is sufficiently real and important to justify the high priority which we are giving to it in our domestic as well as our foreign policy. Every American must judge for himself whether or not it is better to retaliate against an attack from foreign bases, or whether it is in our interest to leave it entirely up to other nations to defend themselves against Soviet aggression.

There may be better ways of organizing our military defense than the one we have chosen. There may be more effective or less costly means for preventing a Soviet attack. I am sure that our program will change as our experience and wisdom grows and that our foreign policy will change with it. The one thing that we as Americans must not do, however, is ignore the realities of the situation we are in. I am confident that in assessing those realities we will not, regardless of honest differences, waiver in following our own national self-interest, welcoming allied solidarity and cooperation, and fortified in the knowledge that we are sharing mutual responsibilities and risks. Only by rallying our faith and our strength to meet the challenge can we be true to the people of America and the heritage which has made them great.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a foreign policy bill, not an appropriation bill. Our committee has been reexamining our foreign policy since we started our hearing on April 5. This bill overhauls the basic policy and administrative structure of our foreign-aid legislation. It repeals 14 different acts. It replaces a patchwork of stopgap, piecemeal measures with permanent law, but provides for an annual review of the authorizations and for continuous reports to the committees involved.

The bill is 82 pages long. The hearings have 1,326 pages and the index runs for 125 pages. Our report contains 113 pages. In addition to these, we have at the committee table 2 program books containing 641 pages describing in detail the programs and the economic conditions in each of the countries.

I am going to try to cover all of these in 15 minutes. If I can, I will yield for questions at the end, but it may be that Members can find the answers to their questions in this mass of material which I have just described.

I want, first of all, to pay tribute to our chairman and the beloved members of our committee who have labored so long together; to our devoted, hard-working, and intelligent staff; to the presentation team headed by Glenn Lloyd. This has been a colossal job. The man hours and the woman hours they have consumed are utterly incalculable, and my own feeling of gratitude toward them is immeasurable.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this program and the preparation of this bill

have taken place during very critical days in world affairs. There were battles, conferences, defeats, negotiations, disagreements, disappointments and, latest but not least, an international weekend here in Washington. Honest doubts have arisen among some of our brethren as to the timing of House consideration of this bill. It has been suggested that we defer final action until things are more settled. Our committee felt otherwise by a vote of 17 to 4. We think a lot of things will not get settled until we start settling them. We think that in a naughty world of uncertainty, confusion, and doubt, the greatest legislative body on this planet, the American Congress, should march steadily and promptly forward with the business of providing the means of waging peace in a cold war. We think we should not wait for any international conference or foreign statesmen to tell us what we want to do. We think we should show the world at this time that we still have money and power and the will to use them, and courage and confidence.

TITLE I. MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

The bill has five titles.

Eighty-seven percent of the fiscal year 1955 authorizations for appropriations of \$3,440 million is in title I, for military assistance and support of military effort. Over 90 percent of the \$9,700 million of unexpended balances is for the same purposes. There are all kinds of ways of classifying the various programs in this bill. We note that the President has more under "military" in his last message than he had in his budget message, and your committee has placed more under this title than the President did. For instance, only \$1,375 million, 40 percent of the total of the bill, is exclusively for providing military hardware and training; the rest of the title is to support and insure the effective use of the military hardware and the training.

Infrastructure is in title I; \$321 million, \$122 million to be appropriated this year.

Direct forces support is \$945 million. That is 27 percent of the bill.

Defense support is \$465 million. That is 13 percent of the bill.

These two items, direct support and defense support, we may call economic aid, if we wish. But let us take Korea where they are building toward the support of 20 divisions, while the United States has 17 divisions. That war-torn country simply does not have what it takes, does not have the economic base to support the military forces that they want and we think they need in the interest of their security and ours, unless they receive economic support, call it relief, economic aid, or whichever you please. The same thing applies to Formosa, to Greece, Turkey, and Spain. They cannot arm and support the forces that they want and we think they need for their security and ours unless they have outside economic support. That is where about half of title I goes.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY CONCEPT

Every country that gets anything under title I signs a mutual security agreement. Here is the policy and the arithmetic and the economy involved in this

mutual security idea. There are those who think we should reexamine everything now, and do nothing for a while or perhaps pick up our marbles all over the world, stop everything we are doing and come home and wait for the Soviets to come over here and then fight them. I think if we did that they would be over, and we would fight them here, alone.

I have seen the war-devastated countries of Europe and I believe that our policy should be that if war must come, we should arrange to fight it away from home and on friendly shores and not do all the fighting ourselves. That is what mutual security is about. We need forward bombing bases and supplies of strategic materials in friendly lands. When we give other countries a chance to defend their own soil, with our help, we help them, and we help ourselves.

Let us talk about the economy involved. United States forces are now 3,046,000 men; 17 divisions-plus; 115 air wings now, and a navy, and the cost this year, in the bill we passed the other day, is \$28 billion. This present bill will furnish arms and training and support for 175 divisions spread all over the earth; 220 Air Force squadrons; 1500 naval aircraft, and considerable naval forces, and the cost will be about \$3 billion.

It costs to maintain one American serviceman overseas \$5,866 a year, without a weapon in his hand. Look at page 156 of our hearings. It costs to maintain one European serviceman \$1,112 a year with no weapon in his hand. By this bill we spend about \$700 per man for these 175 divisions scattered all over the earth, to put weapons in their hands and to contribute partially toward their maintenance. When we do that, it seems to me, when we move forward with a mass of 175 divisions compared to our 17 and compared with 175 divisions the Russians have, we move in the direction not only of our security but of economy. Can we be sure they will all fight in the common cause? No, for they vary in ability, skill and willingness. We can be very sure, however, that hardly any of them can or will fight if we cut off all our aid now, as some suggest.

Title I has a purpose statement, section 101, on disarmament.

In spite of this vast military program we are still willing to disarm whenever that can be done with safety. Section 101 also provides for a joint organization in the Pacific and Far East. Those 2 provisions have been in the law 5 years, since they were first written in by our committee. So that this proposal of an SEATO, a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, that some people say popped up first this spring, has been part of the official foreign policy written into law by Congress for 5 years, the proposal that Secretary Dulles and our President are urging at the present time.

Section 102 of the bill limits the use of Armed Forces personnel to advisory and training purposes of a noncombatant nature. This limitation on the use of armed personnel is in this bill, with executive approval.

Section 106 (b) contains the Richards amendment, 1946 version, with reference to EDC. We are providing for going ahead with EDC, but we have some language that would provide for an agonizing reappraisal if EDC is not ratified. The United States is not fooling around on the European army. We are for going ahead.

In section 106 (b) and section 121 we provide for Indochina and southeast Asia and the western Pacific, \$800 million in addition to unexpended balances that bring the total up to \$1,390,000,000. There are other people and nations who are stalled at this point and for going backward, but we are not fooling around on what should be done out there. We are for going ahead.

Section 107 provides for reimbursable aid. Many people have not heard of this because it does not cost anything, but under that section, \$677 million of arms have been sold to 46 other countries with, of course, Canada in the lead as a purchaser. I personally hope that this section, where other nations pay for their arms, gets to be the biggest section in this whole bill someday.

TITLE II. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

This is a new concept. It is economic aid greater than technical assistance, not for war recovery, not to sustain military effort. Israel, the Arab States, India, and Bolivia are included. The amount is \$224 million, 7 percent of the whole bill. The committee requires one-half of this to be in loans; therefore, the grant money under the development section, title II, is \$112 million, or 3.5 percent of the total of the bill.

TITLE III. TECHNICAL COOPERATION

We have put into this provision what the American people thought was there all the time. This idea of technical assistance that started years ago and was carried on successfully during World War II by Nelson Rockefeller in Latin America was first enacted into policy law by the Republican 80th Congress in the act for exchange of persons and skills. President Truman appropriated that for the fourth point in his inaugural address in 1949. We have now got it into shape where all parties agree that it is a good permanent measure. There is \$132 million provided, which is 4 percent of the total. We have provided in section 304 that commodities and equipment under this program can be furnished only for instruction or demonstration purposes. It is not the idea of the committee that this shall become a new and expanded form of economic aid all over the world.

TITLE IV. OTHER PROGRAMS

This is sort of a miscellaneous part of the bill that has certain important sections.

Section 401 provides a special fund to furnish the President with \$150 million for liberation purposes under the Kersten amendment and for unforeseen emergencies. Thus, with the two provisions in section 106 and section 501 authorizing transfers of 10 percent from one part of bill of title I to another, and 10 percent from one part of the bill to another provided the transfer does not increase any amount over 10 percent,

gives the Executive the flexibility we feel is necessary in such legislation in troubled times like the present.

Title IV contains new authorizations of \$96 million or 3 percent of the bill, and it takes care of Berlin, where we have a special program, the children's welfare fund, ICEM, a refugee organization, UNREF, another refugee organization.

PALESTINE REFUGEES AND VARIOUS OTHER PROGRAMS

Along about here in the bill, some sort of new ideas have come in. We provide for some activities and limitations that are a little different. We provide that \$500 million of this program shall be paid for with agricultural surpluses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman. I have already allotted all the time we have at our desk, but I do have a few more things which might be said in this general outline of what the bill is about.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, although for 8 years our committee has been handling the matter of agricultural surpluses and had provided for the use of over \$8½ billion of agricultural surpluses in the foreign aid programs, it was decided this should be handled otherwise this year. However, we have in this bill a provision that \$500 million of the whole program will be furnished exclusively out of agricultural surpluses.

Section 454 extends the remaining \$150 million for guaranties to include guaranties against war, revolution and insurrection, in addition to the present guaranties with reference to flexibility of currency and expropriation. These guaranties have been little used. Only about \$45 million of guaranties have been written. There has never been a loss and we have made about a million dollars in fees collected. But no country, no businessman, and no bureaucrat, I suspect, is going to use guaranties, if he can get grant-aid money, and it is hoped by some restrictions on grant-aid money and the reduction in the amount that the guaranty provision will be used more.

Section 505 provides that 10 percent of the money obligated under titles I and II shall be loans. This might amount to as much as \$338 million. Our committee through past years has required over a billion and one-half dollars of our aid should be in the form of loans. This has always been resisted by the Executive. All the loans we authorized have been taken up. None of them have been defaulted. Over \$49 million of collections have already been paid in on these loans. As a matter of fact, in the table which my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] gave you recently, some of the aid we sent out has been repaid. Since the war, over \$11 billion of our foreign aid has been in the form of loans, and since World War II, there have been payments on interest and principal on these Government loans, which the bankers say are no good, of over \$3,700,000,000. So that it is the hope of the committee that we get development activity and some things like

that into the form of loans instead of grants.

These three provisions make a sizable total.

Agricultural surpluses.....	\$500,000,000
Guaranties	150,000,000
Loans	338,000,000

Total.....	988,000,000
------------	-------------

If those are used as they should be, and as we hope they will be, there will be a substantial reduction in the use of grant-aid funds that are not earmarked.

TITLE V. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title V contains administrative machinery. Here I confess to two conflicting beliefs. In the first place, I believe that if unification is good for the Defense Department, which involves our overseas military activities, triplication is not good for our overseas nonmilitary activities. I think all of those nonmilitary activities should be in the State Department, but the President has provided otherwise in Reorganization Plans 7 and 8, for FOA and USIA.

My other belief which conflicts somewhat is that any Executive should have rather broad authority to organize things the way he wants, because form of organization should be the servant not the master, in getting things done. Therefore this bill in title V leaves organization matters up to the President. He can go on with an independent FOA or eliminate it or consolidate it at any time.

This bill is permanent legislation, in that it has no termination date for the whole program, but annual reports are required and notices of changes in program, and the Congress as well as the President can terminate any program to any country at any time.

This finishes my outline of the main provisions of the bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman said that EDC was going ahead. The gentleman knows it is really a dead issue at this time. I thought the gentleman might discuss it, because some time ago I think Secretary Dulles said something about an agonizing reappraisal of the EDC, and bringing up the question of rearmament of Germany. I wonder if the gentleman would take a few minutes to tell the committee just what the situation is, and whether Secretary Dulles is going to give in this agonizing appraisal consideration in the rearmament of Germany militarily.

Mr. VORYS. The discussion of that in our report, which I helped to write, is so good that I know it will give the gentleman all the information he desires, but I do not have time to read it to the gentleman. I also know that the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. RICHARDS], when he speaks to us, will give an explanation of this amendment which, as I said, provides first for going ahead with EDC; and, second, provides an arrangement so that a reappraisal can be had, if necessary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to \$500 million for disposal of surplus agricultural products.

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is this in addition to or a part of the legislation passed last week?

Mr. VORYS. Momentarily it is a part of it, although we had a moving target to tie to. But, as I understand, that bill provided for \$1,300,000,000 when it passed the House, and as it came out of conference, \$750 million. If that is correct, I would imagine—I cannot speak for the committee—but I imagine the committee would probably have in the next few hours or days an agonizing reappraisal of that provision and make it a separate provision in this bill for \$500 million to be used for this program, and then let the \$700 million be used as the conferees and the President saw fit. That would mean that there would be a possibility that there still could be \$1,250,000,000 of agricultural surpluses used for various purposes under the two bills. However, that is only my opinion.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. For your own personal opinion, does the gentleman think we should continue to work with France and Italy in this EDC program? It is my opinion we should build on strength rather than on weakness. Does not the gentleman think it is about time that this agonizing reappraisal talked about by Secretary Dulles should give immediate consideration to the rearmament of Germany militarily?

Mr. VORYS. I happen to think there is some reappraisal talk going on among the other members of EDC. They have called a meeting to discuss the matter. I would not be surprised if that were being discussed at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue; and I also would not be surprised if in those discussions consideration of other alternatives did not have the effect of causing France and Italy finally to ratify EDC—as I say, I would not be surprised.

I do not agree with the gentleman that EDC is dead—yet; although it has been in pretty bad shape for 2 years.

Mr. GAVIN. It has been in existence for 4 years, and it is about time that we have less talk and that some action be taken to build up the defenses of Europe.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. VORYS. That is right; that is provided in the bill and described in the report.

Mr. GAVIN. I will be glad to read the report, but I wanted the gentleman's opinion. You really believe that it is being given consideration, that is, the rearming of Germany militarily to participate in some kind of defense program in this European setup either NATO or EDC.

Mr. VORYS. I think there is quite a lot of discussion of that going on all around the world. Every French leader with any responsible position agrees that

Germany must be rearmed for the safety of Europe. I think, as I stated earlier, we are moving ahead on that front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed under this bill to establish a mercenary army of European refugees?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. There is a provision in the bill for the appropriation—

Mr. VORYS. The Kersten amendment is still in the bill, just as it has been for a number of years.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment states its own purpose. I have defended that amendment in the United Nations against the onslaughts of Mr. Vishinsky who felt that it was a very wicked amendment. I think obviously its purpose speaks for itself; and, again, the report shows what the purpose is.

But Mr. Vishinsky accused me—"this Mr. Vorys is proposing that we have a mercenary army to fight for the Wall Street barons in Europe."

I disagreed with Mr. Vishinsky as to his statement of purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether they are to fight for the Wall Street barons or who they would be fighting for, but do you propose to set up a mercenary army somewhere?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. And is it going to be under our control or someone else's control? Who is going to control this mercenary army?

Mr. VORYS. I tell the gentleman now what I told Mr. Vishinsky, that in my judgment this does not provide for a mercenary army.

Mr. GROSS. What does it provide for?

Mr. VORYS. It provides for taking care of people who have escaped and putting them into the NATO forces if, as, and when that can be made possible.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say—

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman to return to section 402, providing for the earmarking of funds under the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954; can the gentleman state whether this allots \$500 million in effect to the State Department with the remaining \$750 million to the Department of Agriculture as far as these funds are concerned?

Mr. VORYS. All I can say is that section 402 as written attempts to tie it in with the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. It was the purpose of the committee that this should not be in addition to the \$1,300,-

000,000 authorized by that act when it passed the House. Now that that act has come out of conference, as I understand, at a figure of \$750 million, I would think that it would be the purpose of the committee at the appropriate time to offer an amendment which would make it possible that this \$500 million should be administered and carried on to insure that it is useful in this program separately from the other bill. On that I can only say what is clearly in the bill now but it does not so well fit the bill that came out of conference.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Can the gentleman summarize his opinion as to what we really have accomplished by this assistance program since we started it?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. DIES. What have we done? It looks to me as if Russia is stronger today than she has ever been.

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. DIES. She is ready to take Asia. Are we stopping her? Are we accomplishing anything?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. In 1947, Europe was in a state of postwar collapse and the Communists were moving in rapidly in Holland, France, certainly in Italy. A bill was rushed through in 1948 partly for the effect it might have in encouraging the Italians in an election year. Neither Italy, France, nor any other country in Western Europe has gone Communist since. To that extent we have held the line. Communists have not substantially increased their internal forces in any of those countries. That is to the good.

As far as this program is concerned, there was a China Aid Act in 1948. There has been a bipartisan foreign policy in Congress throughout those years to prevent China from going Communist. That policy was not shared by the Truman administration and, as the result, China went Communist.

Greece and Turkey were saved from Communist infiltration and aggression by the Greek-Turkish Act, and now guard the Dardanelles as sturdy allies.

Formosa stands as a constant threat to Red China.

Iran has been saved by measures taken under these aid acts. Pakistan and Iraq have joined as part of a growing southern line of defense.

Europe itself, recovered economically, has poured \$35 billion into a joint rearmament effort that, with our help, has increased their defensive potential several-fold on the ground and 2½ times in the air.

Spain and Yugoslavia are in on our side.

No European country has been taken over by the Reds since we started all this in 1947. In Asia, the picture is different. That is the picture this administration is now trying to correct.

We have had Korea, but no full-out world war III.

Meanwhile, the United States, after fighting and winning two wars, and while accomplishing these results by pouring out aid, has grown to a pinnacle

of wealth and power never seen on this planet before.

We have had some difficulties and problems and disappointments. We face more. But I think that is quite a record of accomplishment. I know it must look that way to the Soviets. I think they hope we will stop this sort of thing. I do not think we should accommodate them.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House are asked to vote on the mutual-security bill at the very time that the distractions of the daily headlines make many wonder whether we should act at all. Some of my colleagues, I am certain, wonder whether the best action we can take is no action.

I can fully understand and sympathize with their concern. But I do not share it. Perhaps my membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee gives me an unfair advantage over them. Our committee started hearings on this bill on April 5. We had no fewer than 66 meetings and heard 80 witnesses. Regardless of how one may feel about the bill, he cannot accuse the committee of hasty consideration.

I approached this bill with an open and inquiring mind. If the executive branch had a case for asking us to vote additional foreign aid, I felt they ought to prove it. I do not subscribe to the theory that the world is our burden. But if the security of our country requires that we strengthen those who are opposed to Soviet communism, then each of us must give careful thought to the request to help them.

After all the evidence was presented, and we had deliberated fully in our committee, we reported out the bill that is now before this House. In our report accompanying the bill, we list the objectives which we believe the bill attains. Let me put them before you so that each of you may know what we on the Foreign Affairs Committee are trying to accomplish through this measure.

First, strengthen the ability of the United States to meet the threat of Soviet aggression. Let me say, in this connection, that the analysis of the military situation by our leading military men like Admiral Radford and General Gruenther make it clear that the Soviet menace is no less today than it was last year.

Second, maintain the stability and security of nations in which the United States has air bases and other defense facilities.

Third, keep the resources of Western Europe and of the free world generally from falling under Soviet domination.

Fourth, avoid action which would destroy efforts on the part of other nations which are in our interest and which we want to succeed.

Fifth, strengthen our ties of cooperation and friendship with the economically underdeveloped nations of the world.

Sixth, curtail expenditures in order that the budget may be brought into balance and that the strength of the United States be maintained.

Seventh, and finally, eliminate all aspects of the foreign operations program not essential to meeting the situation which confronts the United States today.

It is my belief that if the Members study the various sections of this bill, then measure them against the objectives I have stated, they will agree that we have dealt with the present world situation in a manner as realistic as is humanly possible.

I would like to speak about one part of the bill that is a matter of particular interest to me. That is the portion dealing with technical cooperation or, as it is popularly referred to, point 4. I have always supported that program because I believe it offers the best hope to add strength to the free world.

It is natural for us to assume that our closest friends and allies are those who are receiving the most assistance in terms of dollars. Yet there are large parts of the world, outside the Soviet orbit, that are concerned with meeting the bare necessities of life—fighting against hunger, against disease, against illiteracy. They are attractive targets for the Communists who promise so much. It is in our national interest to see that these people overcome their difficulties and improve their lot without surrendering to the Red tyrants.

The technical cooperation program offers them a modest beginning toward their self-improvement. We can show them how to do the things that will improve their economy without any loss of their independence or self-respect. To me the heart of this program has always been the exchange of people—our people going abroad and foreign people coming here to train themselves.

In the last few years there has been a tendency toward sending abroad large amounts of supplies and equipment as part of the technical cooperation program. I regret that because I think, in the long run, such activities will be self-defeating. If we accustom people to improve their crops by sending in fertilizer, and then stop sending it, they are no better off than before we started. Whatever we do has to be done with a view to their carrying on the project. And that means that we ought only to do those things that are inexpensive so that they can take over the projects and keep them going.

This bill brings the technical cooperation program back toward the original idea. At the same time it does not weaken the program. If I thought that it did that, I would oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, whatever partisan attitudes enter into other measures that come before this House I can say that on the Foreign Affairs Committee our differences are not party differences. Each of us is concerned with arriving at a decision that will strengthen the United States abroad in this critical hour of our national history.

I look upon this bill as a vital part of our national defense—as much as the bills we vote on for our military establishments at home. Like many of my colleagues I am disturbed by some of the things our friends abroad do or do not do. But we are partners in a coal-

ition of free peoples. And the essence of freedom is the right to differ. So long as we are seeking a common end, I am willing to do everything I can to strengthen other peoples who prize their freedom as much as we do. This bill will do much, in my opinion, to achieve that purpose. It is for that reason that I urge its passage.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. A brief question.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to ask the gentleman's opinion on the question of rearmament for Germany to participate in NATO or EDC. I do not know whether the gentleman was going to discuss the German situation or not, but I think it is of paramount importance. Nobody seems to want to discuss this German rearmament matter; at least, the speakers that I have listened to thus far. What I am interested in is whether in this agonizing reappraisal that is going to be made the Secretary of State will consider Germany in this EDC setup or not. If the gentleman has an opinion on that, I should like to hear it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Unfortunately, they did not call me in to ask my opinion on it, nor the other members of the committee. For myself, there will be no EDC, as I see it, without rearming Germany. That is my personal view.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I should like to say that I join and associate myself with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in the comments he made regarding the committee and the staff. I should like to say that in my opinion no one has worked as hard as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. It has been a prodigious job. He has certainly applied himself to it. I applaud him for it.

Also, I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that minority views have been printed separately. For some reason that I do not know, these minority views must be asked for at the desk in order to get the printed copy. They are not on the clerk's desk with the majority report. But they are available, and I hope before we complete debate that Members will take the opportunity to read the views that four of us on the committee have expressed.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset there should be no doubt as to the position of those members of the committee who have joined in a presentation of the minority views on this mutual security bill for 1954. Let me quote from the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The undersigned members of the majority party pledge their support to President Eisenhower and to his administration in seeking to promote peace and security in a troubled world.

As stated in our minority views last year on the Mutual Security Act of 1953, we said we "share equally with the President, and all other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, profound desire to achieve such peace and security."

I would also like to quote from the second paragraph of that report:

The proposed Mutual Security Act of 1953, H. R. 5710, marks another attempt in a long series of major foreign policy measures to bring about peace and security in a troubled world. Area-wise, on a large scale, we started off with an Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. When that proved inadequate, we tried a Mutual Defense Assistant Act of 1949. Then to demonstrate that we were concerned equally with directly raising living standards as well as defense standards, the Congress in 1950 put on the statute books an act for International Development. In 1951, the phrase "mutual security" was coined to describe what was termed a "new" approach—lumping together in a package bill the above laws and tying them together not too neatly with almost every single piece of legislation that bore the trade-mark "foreign policy," its nebulous connection with "mutual security" notwithstanding.

Mr. Chairman, what this program needs is a thorough post mortem examination. Each year, it seems, when this legislation is being considered, we are in the gravest crisis in the history of mankind. At this particular time, however, we are indeed in a grave crisis, a crisis which in my opinion compels delay in enactment of the bill that is before us.

Is it not strange, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding our efforts, and they have been sincere, communism is still on the march in Europe and southeast Asia? What is wrong; wherein is this program failing? If spending money and transferring our natural resources pellmell throughout the world could stop Communist aggression, then the battle should have been won before this. But, it goes on year after year and it seems to me that the policies established under this legislation now demand a New Look in the interest of peace and security.

It cannot be said that the American people have failed in their effort to contribute to peace and security in the world. Starting in 1917 until the end of the Korean war the taxpayers of our country had given to other nations all over the world in excess of \$129 billion. In that same period the United States for itself has invested in national defense and preparedness more than \$677 billion, yet there is no peace, there is no security for our people or for the world.

Has not the time come, perhaps it is long past due, for the Congress of the United States to evaluate this program? It certainly is our responsibility. Some may contend that this is a program that must go on for years. The American people, however, have grave doubts about it.

The ills of the world, as I see it, are not primarily military or economic. They are political and spiritual. This program fails to take into consideration these important elements.

Recently the Secretary for Defense, Mr. Wilson, returned from an extended trip abroad and he said that the world problem is not military but political. Witnesses appearing before our committee have said again and again that the free world is plagued by political unrest. How then does this bill before us meet these political and the spiritual problems, assuming that the judgment of these witnesses are sound?

As a matter of fact we rely on the force of military might and material goods to meet the issues of Communist aggression. We have adopted the Marxist philosophy of giving to governments material wealth in the hope it would buy friends. We have also been supporting with our billions of dollars defunct regimes and socialistic governments that have failed to provide the kind of leadership that freemen want and need. We have absolutely ignored the principles used in our own country and we have failed to impress upon the rest of the world that if men are free they can solve their own problems without governmental interference.

The vast billions we have expended on this program alone have not reached the mass of the people. I have made that statement in past years when this legislation was before us. We have failed, in spite of these great expenditures, to win friends and people to the free world concept.

Why do we not give the people a chance to help themselves as the pioneers in our own country helped themselves and established the greatest Nation on earth with the highest standard of living ever attained in the history of mankind. We are proud of that achievement today, yet move forward to greater programs for the good of the free people, in science and other fields.

Private initiative, the hope of reward and the expectation of achievement have always been primarily responsible for the advancement of mankind. Can you find in this legislation any suggestion that the individual could hope to find some avenue of achievement?

We fully understand in this country that continued progress, be it spiritual or material, rests squarely upon a better understanding of the idea and individual freedom of choice and action with personal responsibility for one's own decisions. Yet today we find that governments are on the backs of the people and they are unable to go forward as we have gone forward. What has happened to our salesmanship, can we not sell the great American idea to the world?

What the rest of the world needs to know is how the United States achieved its present standards. In what way have we tried to advance the American idea, except by the scattering of our billions of dollars throughout the world in the hope that we could buy friends and security.

It is not sufficient to keep on reminding other people in other countries that the average American family lives twice as well as the family in the other nation, that it lives 10 to 20 times as well as the average Russian family, with all due respect to the great majority of the Russians. We must do more than brag about our achievements. We must be aware of the fact that the Communists have used these same facts to make people hate us, to make people envious enough to join the Communist plan to destroy our way of life, to destroy liberty and freedom and to take over what we have for themselves.

For one thing what we should be doing is telling them about the American idea of production, of the spiritual and mate-

rial gains in life through faith and freedom, and not by a system which through force generates fear and hate.

The standards of living which we have and for which we are so thankful are not accidental but are found wherever the atmosphere of freedom and private ownership of property have prevailed, where men could try out their ideas and succeed or fail on their own worthiness. A reading of history leaves but one conclusion that where the coercive force of government exists, where government seeks to impose its will upon the people, progress has been slow and plodding. As we look about us we know the truth of that fact, for as we enumerate the blessings which we have, government, as such, has played a very minor role. What did government have to do originally in the field of science and industry? Yet there are those today who believe that all-powerful government centralized and focused in one place can and should be the only dynamic force in civilization. This is a fallacy, and we are coming to learn that fact more and more each day.

Instead of governmental interference our country has grown to its present position where millions of people free and uninhibited have gone forward thinking creatively in terms of the wants and needs of our people. And the end is not yet in sight if we can avoid the prohibition of a coercive and centralized government.

Let us then remember one salient and dominant fact that if men and women are free to try their ideas in an open competitive market in an atmosphere of freedom all over the world communism as such will cease to be a factor and a threat to a free world civilization. This bill is silent on this fundamental proposition.

In many areas of the world misery and poverty prevail. As a people we want to help, we want to help them if we can. We have done very little to date under this program because we have failed to understand the basic need of those people and we have failed to understand the real solution of their problem.

We should recognize that the causes of misery and poverty in the so-called undeveloped areas of the world are not different from the causes of misery and poverty in our own land. They are, I believe, to be found in imperfect human relationships and the cure is to be found in improving those relationships where there is a sense of fairness and equity, where personality is respected, where children are loved, womanhood honored, and old age revered, morale is generally good and poverty and misery is not a problem. These are facts that we are prone to ignore and as we look to this legislation before us it seems to me that we are failing to direct our efforts toward policies that will eventually achieve the state of affairs that I have just referred to.

What direction should our policies take? In what way can this program be revamped if we decide to do it? Let me suggest:

First. Consider ways and means of meeting the political unrest engendered

by Communist methods of infiltration and subversion.

Second. Go directly to the people with whatever material assistance we can give them by way of food and clothing.

Third. Establish private agencies to administer a program of assistance. Remove government insofar as possible from these operations.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I simply want to say that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has been a most diligent and able member of our committee. He has been most helpful during the consideration of this bill. Of course, that is also true of other members of our committee who have signed the minority report. I certainly want to thank the gentleman for the efforts you have made while we were studying this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the provisions of this bill dealing with Indochina or southeast Asia. This bill reauthorizes old expenditures under the mutual defense assistance program, that is, principally for end items and reauthorizes unexpended balances of \$458,100,000. In addition to that, it authorizes \$308 million in new appropriations for the same purpose. For the direct forces support program, which consists of direct aid to armies in the field, it reauthorizes appropriations of \$590 million, and in addition provides for an authorization of \$800 million more of new money. Under the mutual defense support program for Indochina, which consists of economic aid, largely designed to build up its military capacity, this bill reauthorizes \$28½ million of old funds and provides authorization for \$21½ million in new money. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the total amount involved in this bill for Indochina is \$1,076,200,000 of old money and \$1,129,500,000 new money, making a total involved in Indochina of \$2,205,700,000.

Now the justification for this enormous authorization, both last year and this year, was that it was to implement the Navarre plan. Before the committee for weeks, the executive presented testimony and charts and programs and maps and details of what this money was being spent for and what it will be spent for in the implementation of the so-called Navarre plan. It has been explained too what the Navarre plan is, and that it is to build up native forces and troops who will do their own fighting, and that we, in the United States, are to supply the materials and furnish the ammunition for those troops.

Two contracts with the French Government have been put before the committee, under which there was to be provided for the Navarre plan 55 battalions, schools for noncommissioned officers, 1,500 miles of new road that we were to supply, and they were to supply the troops. These charts explain that, the number and details, the tanks, the

planes, the jeeps, the ammunition, and so forth necessary to carry out that program. In the books on the table all of that is gone into in great detail, and the fiscal year program is justified solely and only in the testimony in support of the Navarre plan.

On page 381 of these books it is stated that should the French plan prove incapable of execution; or should other unforeseen circumstances arise, the United States would not consider itself obligated beyond the amount that has already been made available.

This mass of evidence showed that the executive branch recognized that Congress has control of the purse, and it is the duty of the executive branch to justify the authorizations it seeks by detailed plans. During the committee consideration we all know what became of the Navarre plan. With the fall of the French fortress of Dien Bien Phu and the dismissal of General Navarre, the Navarre plan is now defunct. Immediately when disaster in that direction threatened, the Secretary of State flew to the north, he flew to the south, and he flew to the east apparently in an effort to find somebody who, under some circumstances, would join this country in a war in Indochina. Up to this time no one has been willing to do so.

The upshot of all this is that all of the tables, all of the charts, all of the testimony which the Executive Department has put in as justification for these figures in support of the Navarre plan have no validity whatever, and there is no additional evidence, no substitute evidence and no other evidence brought forward to justify the expense. Yet the bill carries, as it is reported to you from the committee, the exact amount justified by a computation made on the basis of a purpose that no longer exists. The only limitation in the language in the bill is that it is to be made available on such terms and conditions, including the transfer of funds, as the President may specify.

May I ask the question, What are they going to do with all of that money? Do you know? Does anybody know? Do you think Grandma Dulles knows? None of them knows.

In the committee, Mr. Chairman, I moved that \$800 million of that sum, the amount provided for the direct support of the army in the field, be eliminated from the bill, and the committee report should state that the committee was prepared to support any new plan, when and if it was formulated, for the defense of southeast Asia, but until a plan was formulated that we would retain control over the purse, which the Constitution says is exclusively our responsibility.

Objection was made that foreign countries would think we were running out on them. How could that be true if the committee report stated and specified that the funds would be provided when and if a plan is formulated?

The President in his message to us said that the funds are necessary because of rapidly changing conditions in southeast Asia. Mr. Chairman, the views of the President are entitled to great respect, but I respectfully submit that

under the reauthorization there is \$1,076,000,000 of old funds, and the bill would continue to have \$329,500,000 in new funds or a total of nearly \$1½ billion dollars. How could there be an emergency so sudden that \$1½ billion would not provide for the emergency until such time as the Congress could act? If \$1½ billion will not save us in an emergency, another \$800 million is not going to do it.

In the committee I offered another amendment which, it seemed to me, was simple enough, so simple that there could be very little objection to it. It recited verbatim, without any embellishment, without any attempt to interpret, the language of the United States Constitution as to the responsibility of the Congress in such matters as these. It recited the responsibility of the Congress to provide for the national defense, to declare war, and to make rules for the governance of the land and naval forces, and to make such laws as necessary and proper for carrying into execution these responsibilities. The amendment further provided that no funds should be used for combat of American troops outside of territorial United States except in such cases as the President, the Commander in Chief, might be authorized under the Constitution.

I did not attempt to interpret the language of the Constitution; I merely recited it in the exact language of the Constitution, and it seems a remarkable thing to me that we have come to the point where the recitation of the very words of our Constitution should be considered to interfere with American policy.

Mr. Chairman, the issues I am raising here do not involve a question of money; they do not involve the question of economy; they do not involve returning this country to any isolationist policy; they involve the grave constitutional question of whether this Congress should surrender its power over the purse and over the right to control war; and I say to you that if this Congress does not retain its power in those two respects then there is but little use to continue it in existence.

I recognize that during these perilous times extraordinary powers must be entrusted to the Executive, particularly in a case of emergency; but dictatorial powers should not be delegated unnecessarily. With the present Chief Executive there is no danger that such powers would be abused, but this may not always be true.

For my part I do not believe that the situation at the present time requires the Congress to surrender its constitutional control of the purse and its sole responsibility to determine when American youth should be committed to war in the absence of such emergency over which the President has power to act. I have confidence in the ability of the American people through their duly elected representatives to meet these momentous problems without abandoning the constitutional responsibilities of Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today H. R.

9678, the Mutual Security Act of 1954. It could not have come before us at a more difficult moment. The international weekend that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] mentioned, unfortunately, has not as yet contributed anything to clarify our problems.

The happenings over the last years have placed us in a position of grave responsibility—responsibility to all sorts and conditions of men. We cannot very well walk out on those responsibilities.

This bill does not come to you hastily or just thrown together. Your committee began its hearings on April 5 and worked steadily until we reported the bill out on June 24. We spent a great many weeks of study, findings, and hearings. There were 80 witnesses who appeared before us and additional material was placed in the record. Sixty-six meetings and endless overtime in study have resulted in this bill.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] explained, this is a new bill. It repeals the existing patchwork of 14 statutes relating to foreign aid and munitions control and provides comprehensive, basic legislation to replace them. I want to associate myself very much with those who have spoken of the magnificent work that has been done by our chairman and by the majority leader of the committee, the ranking Republican member, JOHN VORYS. He has been very faithful and very hard working. He has worked against some heavy odds. I take my hat off to him.

I also want to say that the staff has been unbelievably fine. They do not seem to care whether they sleep or not when it comes to pressure at the end of all these hearings.

This program combines features of long- and short-term policy. It provides for better defense of the United States through the increase of the military potentials of our allies which can be added to our own strength. It helps to create conditions in the underdeveloped countries of the world which would improve their standard of living and make them healthy members of the free community of nations, willing and able to resist the ever-present Communist threat.

The mutual-security program, of which mutual-defense assistance is the military part, has been a major factor in the creation of fighting forces in Europe of such size, composition, and effectiveness as to serve as a strong deterrent to any further Soviet or Soviet-inspired aggression. In the event such aggression does occur, MSA-created forces stand ready to effectively counter it.

Through the combined efforts of all the participating nations we now have an integrated, effective combat structure in Europe. The defense needs of a given country are determined in cooperation and consultation with the United States military authorities, but frequently this necessary defense strength cannot be achieved or maintained without economic support. The funds of chapter 3, defense support, are designed to provide such support.

In the fiscal year 1954 the emphasis was shifted from Europe to Asia and the Pacific. In 1955 the proposed legisla-

tion reflects a further shift from Europe to the Near East and Africa and to Asia and the Pacific. The committee report on page 8 calls your attention to this shift in emphasis.

In the past 3 fiscal years, the funds allocated for Europe dropped from 73 percent in 1953 to 27 percent in 1955, while for Asia and the Pacific it rose from 14 to 50 percent.

The program has been substantially reduced. For example, in the fiscal year 1953 we authorized over \$6 billion, whereas this year's bill would authorize only \$3,440,000,000. That is a reduction of over \$2 billion in a 2-year period, but at no point has the administration proposed economy at the expense of national security. The American people do not want such pledges. If we reduce this program further we will have to spend more money on our domestic defense and in addition jeopardize our security. Our military leaders tell us that we cannot stand alone and that money spent on the military portion of the mutual-security program is the cheapest way of obtaining our defense objectives. As the nations in Europe have grown militarily stronger, we have been able to reduce our program of military assistance. In 1951 that was over \$5 billion, in 1955 \$1,580,000,000.

Today, 9 years after the end of the war, we face an increased global threat of Communist aggression. That the Soviet policies have not changed can be seen from the fact that at no point have the Soviet leaders been willing to cooperate with the West to attempt to lessen the world tension. They need this tension for the success of their plans. The clearly demonstrated Soviet attitude in regard to unification of Germany, the peace treaty with Austria, free navigation on the Danube, and their whole policy in Asia are individual manifestations of the unchangeable determination for world domination. If Russia made some concessions and retreated, as was the case in Iran in 1946, in Berlin in 1948, and to a degree in Korea recently, it happened only because the Soviet leaders did not consider that the moment for armed conflict had come and probably they were ready.

WHY HAVE RUSSIANS BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN THEIR POLICY OF ENSLAVEMENT?

When the war ended we allowed ourselves to relax, diminished our Armed Forces and went back to peaceful production. The same general policy was followed by our Western Allies as they set about rebuilding while Russia continued to build her strength and developed new aggressive plans. Many will tell you that the Russians have been successful in their policies directed toward world domination for today they are holding under the shadow of the Kremlin 800 million people and vast natural resources.

Why have they been successful in the policy that leads to deprivation of all human freedoms and is resented by all freemen? The answer is simple. The Soviet Union has had, since the time of its inception, a concrete and unchangeable plan for world domination and has been working steadily toward the fulfillment of this plan. The countries of

the free world, on the other hand, have been occupied with their own individual national problems and have been inclined to underestimate the advance of the Soviet power. Individual manifestations of the Soviet drive were opposed by us but we were mostly treating the symptoms and not the disease itself. We are fully aware now that only a dynamic, positive policy can withstand the impact of the negative destructive ideas of Communist conspiracy.

Morality, the force of public opinion, religious concepts of right and wrong do not influence Soviet leaders in their policies.

I say to you with very deep feeling that the only possible way for us to change the course of things in the world is to lead from strength; that is, to be very strong.

WHAT OUR AID PROGRAMS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED

We have helped European countries to regain a strength which has resulted in the establishment of a strong NATO organization. That Russia fears this organization can be seen from the intensity of the propaganda against it and from the fact that whenever we attempt to negotiate with them, they persistently demand that we abandon the NATO.

We must not forget that because of our assistance, armed aggression against Greece was decisively defeated, that the Russians were unable to take over West Berlin, which today is an island of freedom within the Soviet zone of Germany, and people risk their lives to reach this oasis in the desert of oppression. Because of the Mutual Security program, Iran, the Philippines, Thailand, to name a few, have developed strength and maintained internal order. Whenever we stood united, Russian plans failed. Wherever the free world lacked initiative and determination, the Communists advanced.

WHY IS THERE NEED OF ECONOMIC HELP?

Loss of Asia and Africa to our trade and commerce, inability to obtain natural resources essential to us would have a disastrous effect on our economy. I have before me a list of 48 essential strategic materials used in the United States, comparing domestic production with imported supply. Only in case of 11 items do we together with Canada supply over 50 percent of our requirements. In case of 12 other items, we produce anywhere between 2 to 39 percent of our requirements. In case of the remaining 25 items, we depend entirely on foreign imports coming from Asia, Africa, and South America.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE COUNTRIES WE HAVE HELPED?

Famine-plagued India has increased her food production by 5 million tons as compared to her good year crop of 1949-50, and she thinks that the time is near when, barring national calamity, she will be self-sufficient in foodstuffs. Greece has become practically self-sufficient in wheat, and Turkey is now one of the major wheat-exporting countries when in the past it greatly relied on wheat imports. Panama and Jamaica are practically self-sufficient in rice. All over the Caribbean area we have been of great assistance in re-

housing the people that have been swept into the sea by the hurricanes. Only those who have seen the hurricane-devastated villages in that area realize of what importance these projects are, for they reach true "grassroots" of the country. All this through two specially trained technicians. Could anything be more economical?

Our program of technical cooperation in Thailand is amazingly successful. The Soviets in their propaganda to that country have done everything possible to convince the Thai people that America is a warmongering imperialist interested in depriving them of their thousands-year-old liberty and in turning them into its satellite. Yet by working with our people, by receiving instructions in the fields of agriculture, education, and public health the people have learned to regard us as friends.

The attitude of the Thai people toward us is the best and the least expensive way of counteracting the Soviet propaganda and psychological offensive and showing the people of Asia that we want them on our side, but free and independent and not as satellites.

The same is true in the New Hemisphere, where it is of basic importance that there be no Communist toehold.

DO WE NEED MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM?

This program of mutual security is one of the instruments of our policy designed to keep us in a position of leadership and to help the friendly countries to remain free through improvement of their military and economic position. Whenever we have adopted positive, strong programs we have been successful.

We must remember that mutual security is the logical counterpart of our efforts to eliminate communism within the United States. Mutual security attacks the Red conspiracy at its very source.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM?

What is the alternative?

If we abandon this program we would be perpetually on the defensive, leaving to the Kremlin the final decisions of when and where to attack. You will remember that there were 12 free nations bordering Russia in 1939. Today there are but five. She has swallowed up the rest.

If we are to stand alone, turning ourselves into a fortress, a tremendous program for total defense in every cranny of the United States at unimaginable cost would have to result.

WE HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO FULFILL

What we must never forget is that a basic principle of Communist strategy is to divide—so the U. S. S. R. has sewn suspicion of the United States wherever possible. Because we are the strongest member of the free community of nations, naturally Moscow wants most of all to destroy us. The Kremlin has systematically attempted to undermine all efforts that lead to the political and economic unity of Europe. To a degree, the Soviets have been successful in this. But this does not mean that we should abandon our responsibilities when some irresponsible elements cry, "Yankee, go home."

We are not pursuing these costly policies in pursuit of gratitude and popularity. Our very strength and ability to help often makes us unpopular. But we must also remember that our aid programs, both military and economic, are undertaken in cooperation with the interested governments. They are not imposed upon them. We have no satellites. To us, only free nations voluntarily joining together can fulfill our hope for the world.

It may be asked what guarantees do we have that we will be successful in the objectives we pursue through this mutual-security program. Is a fireman always sure that he will be able to extinguish the fire threatening to destroy a house? Is he to stop in the middle of the road to consider all the chances against him, meanwhile letting the whole street burn down because of his indecision? We are engaged in the deadliest of struggles where the very existence of freedom and human rights is at stake. We must assume the responsibility of the position into which we have been thrown, we cannot retreat.

I would say in closing this, that a country is not made of bricks and mortar. A country is made up of its people, the families, the mothers, the fathers, the daughters, the aunts, the uncles, the cousins.

Let me remind you that a country is its people: In houses and alone, in families, fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, uncles, aunts, cousins—multiplied—that is a country and it is only as strong as its people. We must be strong and we must help our allies to be strong. Are we strong? Do we know what strength is? This is a moment when we must stop listening to all the little whistles of the alley fights. We must get together and be strong. We must unite, forgetting the aisle, regardless of the differences within our own parties. We must get behind the President of the United States and put down the greatest enemy mankind has ever known.

When we give, and we must, we must give with strength, with unity, and with responsibility so that we will contribute to the strength of allies with whom we are united in this common struggle against despotism and tyranny. Otherwise we will lose everything that has been built for freemen in this, our world.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill being considered by the committee. I have continuously supported and do support the entire idea that if this country is to assume the leadership in the fight for democracy and freedom throughout the world we must lend a helping hand and give guidance and assistance to those who are more hard pressed than we have been in this country and who have not been as fortunate as we have been; and lift them

up to a standard where they can join in the fruits of democracy.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, several things have come up in the past several years which have made an impression upon me in regard to the attitude of some of those concerned with the administration of our relationships with foreign countries and I cannot help but mention one phase of that at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I may lay before the House a detailed report on a problem which has become of major interest to me, and which has a direct connection with the Mutual Security Act and the Foreign Operations program which we are considering today. I intend to raise serious questions as to the United States Government action and policy as regards purchases of heavy electrical power-producing equipment for installation in Government power projects. The major question I shall ask the House is whether it is sound policy for this administration to place reliance on foreign manufacturers of this type of equipment to the virtual exclusion of American industry. My personal belief is that it is not. I have two basic reasons for that belief. Firstly, I believe that the national security, heavily dependent on power-producing potential, is placed in danger when this Government goes abroad to buy equipment on which we must depend to keep our industrial machine alive. Secondly, although I am and have been a firm supporter of the programs through which the United States has given economic and military aid to friendly nations in an effort to put them back on their feet, I believe that the time is past when we in the United States can afford to ignore completely our self-interest while building up the domestic economies of our friendly allies and former enemies. When that policy is carried to the point where elements of a vital domestic industry are in danger of being put out of business, I feel that the time has come to take another look at the policy—to borrow a phrase much overused today—a new look but a hard one, too.

When American workmen are losing jobs as a direct result of actions by officials of our Government in this field, we had better put a damper on the activities of some of those starry eyed officials. Unemployment in this country is now so serious that our Government should be taking active steps to reverse the trend rather than using its own contracting system to put more people out of work, as it is doing by its foreign purchases of power-producing machinery.

At the outset I also want to make it clear that I have not abandoned my firm belief in the reciprocal-trade principle. But freedom of commercial trade between nations should not be confused with Government policy in making its own purchases of materials and supplies for use within the United States. It seems to me that a very clear line must be drawn between these two areas of action. The Government is not an ordinary commercial enterprise. Whereas it is perfectly proper for private interests

in the United States to go out into the world market to buy wherever they see fit, so long as such action does not give aid and comfort to our enemies in the cold war, the first duty of the Federal Government lies here at home with domestic industry and labor. My purpose in taking the floor today is to show that this obligation is not now being carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a fully documented report on the way in which Government contracts for such equipment as generators, turbines, transformers, and governors for the powerplants at our big publicly owned and built dams are now being given to foreign companies at the expense of American workingmen and to the detriment of the limited number of American firms which are capable of producing this vital equipment. Since I do not have time to give the full story here on the floor, I will ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and will put the material in the *Record*. But I do want to hit the highlights here and now so that my colleagues may become familiar with the way in which a few dreamers in the State Department are taking jobs from skilled American workmen in a vital industry.

Electric power is the basis for our whole industrial economy. It is also absolutely necessary to the national defense and to national security. Without unlimited and uninterrupted supplies of power, we cannot build and keep our atomic installations going; we cannot produce airplanes, guns, tanks, and all the other defense weapons we need; communications and transportation depend on it—in a word, without our electric-power supply we are powerless. The quickest way for a potential enemy to put us out of action would be for him to put our powerplants out of action. Further, our power-producing potential is hard put to it to keep pace with the growing peacetime demand for new power sources. In the event of a national emergency there would be a tremendous new demand. The powerplants the Government is now building, and the dams and plants for which the Federal Power Commission is now issuing licenses to public and private utilities must be ready to meet this demand without unnecessary delay. Turbines, generators, governors, and similar equipment to be installed in these powerplants are as essential to the peacetime or wartime production effort as the atomic weapons, planes, and tanks for which they provide production power are to actual military operations. We would not for one minute consider letting contracts to build munitions to any foreign firm. And yet we are now buying power-producing equipment from foreign countries with the most careless disregard for the same security considerations which prevent us from placing reliance on any foreign manufacturer for our weapons of war.

Construction and delivery of heavy electrical equipment is not an overnight proposition. They are not mass production items. Each separate machine must be designed and built from scratch to

meet special requirements. The process is a matter of months and years. Any interruption in production or delivery could mean an irreparable time loss in getting these powerplants into operation. With world conditions as critical as they are, we certainly can have no assurance that foreign suppliers, either in Europe or in Japan, can deliver on contracts calling for deliveries during the next several years, as is the case on contracts now being awarded. Yet because of pressures from the State Department we are awarding such foreign contracts in increasing numbers, to the extent that during 1953 foreign firms received contracts with a dollar value of almost 65 percent of those awarded to American firms. And the trend is increasing so that, if the policy is continued, it will not be long until foreign manufacturers are supplying our Government with more of this type of equipment than we buy at home. It is time we put a stop to the practice if we value our lives.

Mr. Chairman, since World War II we have poured billions of dollars into rearming our foreign allies and into reestablishing their domestic economies and productive facilities under the Mutual Security Act and similar legislation. We have also spent large sums for operations under the point 4 programs to promote self-sufficiency among the less fortunate nations of the world. I have consistently supported those programs and I believe they have done a world of good, not only to the countries receiving our help but to the United States in preventing the complete loss of Europe and the Far East to communism. However, those programs were intended to help those countries to help themselves and to become self-sufficient as far as providing for the needs of their own people are concerned. They were not intended to build foreign industries to destroy our self-sufficiency and to come in and take jobs away from American workmen—particularly under present conditions when unemployment is on the increase here and where the domestic industry being undermined is as vital to national security as is the power-equipment industry.

In my prepared statement I have given details on a contract involving purchase of hydraulic governors for the powerplant at the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River in Oregon. A firm in my home district in San Francisco was the low American bidder. They were, however, underbid by a Japanese company. The San Francisco company had been encouraged by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to invest considerable sums of money in tooling up their plant to handle this type of job because the United States had insufficient production facilities in that line. They have built up an organization of skilled laborers and technicians so that they can design and build this vital equipment; they pay wages in keeping with our high living standards; and they spent over \$25,000 in preparing their bid for this particular contract. When bids were opened on this

million dollar plus job it was found that the Japanese firm had underbid the San Francisco company by 22.4 percent, well within the 25 percent differential set up in Buy American Act regulations as a governing factor in determining whether contracts for even nonstrategic purchases should be awarded to foreign firms at the expense of American suppliers. Further, it was found that the Japanese bid did not meet the specifications while the San Francisco bid was fully qualified. By every standard the bid should have been awarded to the company in my district. In spite of that, because of State Department pressures all bids were thrown out and readvertising ordered.

The foreign bidders now have the advantage of knowing how low they must bid to get outside the 25 percent buy-American differential. With the low wages they pay they do not have to worry about costs and can adjust their bids to almost any level. Their American competitors, however, who comply with our fair labor standards laws and pay 10 times as much in wages, have already figured as closely as they can on the contract. Their chances for getting the contract are now practically nil, which means that the company in my district must lay off a hundred men. That situation is being repeated all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my office a list of electrical equipment contracts awarded by the Corps of Engineers to foreign firms during the past 2½ years. A similar list was inserted in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation hearings this year. The frequency of the awards is constantly on the increase. Because of the national security factor and the loss of jobs for American workmen we should put a stop to any further awards. In my complete statement I have outlined other considerations which should cause Congress to act without delay, including the fact that equipment supplied by foreign firms is not as reliable or efficient as that built at home, and that lack of maintenance staffs and parts replacement facilities may put it out of service for long periods of time.

State Department policymakers pay no attention to such commonsense arguments as our self-interest in this matter. They prefer to represent the viewpoint of foreign manufacturers rather than the American people who employ them. Present legislation and regulations which would prevent this favoritism to foreign firms if properly administered are ignored. In view of that disregard for the national welfare it is of the greatest importance that this Congress enact legislation at this session to force the Government agencies concerned to buy this highly critical equipment at home. I introduced a bill in the House for that purpose today. The bill has been numbered H. R. 9696, and it will be printed in the *Record* following my remarks. I urge the Committee on Public Works, to which it has been referred, to give it an early hearing, and I ask my colleagues in the House to inter-

est themselves in the matter so that favorable action will not be delayed. So that full information will be readily available I shall extend my remarks at this point and give the complete picture.

To begin at the beginning, I have been aware of this problem for some time, as I am sure is the case with all of my colleagues. My knowledge of the situation was, however, confined chiefly to newspaper reports on the controversy over awarding foreign contracts for generating equipment at the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington and the McNary Dam in Oregon, both part of the Columbia River development. Just last Thursday, June 23, the Department of the Army announced that after considering new bids on the Chief Joseph Dam generators they have awarded the contract for their construction to the Westinghouse Electric Co. Since the foreign firm which was low bidder on the original invitation, English Electric, again underbid Westinghouse by 12½ percent, it seems apparent that the storm of opposition aroused by foreign awards of this type of contract is having some effect. The fact that on the same date another contract for generators at the Dalles Dam powerplant, also on the Columbia River, was awarded to Westinghouse despite a 7½ percent lower bid by English Electric seems to bear this out. However, there is no evidence that the basic policy has been changed, and until Congress takes action we have no assurance that it will be changed.

It was in connection with contracts for the powerplant at the Dalles Dam that I was brought into the middle of this fight. That happened back in January of this year after bids were opened by the Corps of Engineers on a contract for 16-turbine governors to be installed in the powerplant. The bids ranged between \$1,073,000 and \$1,486,000. The lowest domestic bidder was the Pelton Water Wheel Co., located in my district in San Francisco. They were, however, underbid by two foreign firms; a Japanese company, Hitachi, Ltd., and an Italian company. The low Hitachi bid was some \$240,000 below the bid submitted by the Pelton Water Wheel Co., amounting to \$1,314,785.

My attention was called to the pending award by the Pelton firm; by the company's employees; by labor organizations in the area; and by any number of the company's suppliers and firms in related industry. Because of the obvious importance of this particular contract in relieving serious unemployment in my district and preventing further layoffs of skilled help, I began a thorough investigation in order to get the facts and to do what I could to protect the interests of the Pelton Co. and its employees. The facts that were developed soon caused me to broaden my inquiry into the entire field of Government purchases of electrical machinery for Federal power projects.

After preliminary discussions with the Corps of Engineers, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 20 a brief statement in opposition to the

general policy of soliciting foreign bids on this type of equipment. I based that opposition on the fact that by so doing we were not only undermining American industry and the high standards of pay and working conditions we have struggled to build up, but that it is false economy to try to save a few dollars on Government purchases when the domestic industry which loses the contract to a foreign competitor is already suffering from critical unemployment. At that time I did not have full knowledge of the many other considerations involved, but I still hold to that position.

Further, on January 24 I addressed to the Chief of Engineers a letter in which I expressed my strong opposition to foreign award of The Dalles contract specifically, and to the general policy of permitting foreign firms to participate in United States Government construction projects within the United States. I ask that a copy of that letter to General Sturgis be printed at this point in my remarks. My colleagues will note my suggestion that congressional action on the matter seemed warranted.

JANUARY 24, 1954.

Maj. Gen. S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Chief of Engineers,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL STURGIS: It has come to my attention that the Corps of Engineers recently invited bids on hydraulic governors for turbines to be installed in the powerhouse under construction at The Dalles, Ore. I understand that a number of foreign companies were invited to submit bids and that the January 12 opening of bids disclosed that a Japanese firm, the Hitachi Co., was low bidder. I am also advised that an Italian company was second low, and that the Pelton Water Wheel Co., located in my district in San Francisco, and lowest American bidder, was third.

Preliminary discussions with members of your staff indicate that after evaluation of the bids by your district and division offices you will make a determination as to whether the contract should be awarded to one of the foreign firms or let to a domestic bidder. I want to urge most strongly that this contract be awarded to the qualified American company whose bid was lowest among those submitted by domestic firms. Although I do not support letting foreign firms participate in United States Government construction projects or the supplying of equipment therefor at any time, unless no qualified American company can be found, I believe it particularly imperative at this time of rising domestic unemployment to restrict participation in such projects in this country to American firms. The so-called Buy American Act expresses the explicit intent of Congress in this regard. In view of these factors, I feel that the award of the subject contract to any but an American firm would be most unwise. Should the contract be awarded elsewhere I shall feel it incumbent on me to request that the proper congressional committees look into the matter exhaustively.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. Will you kindly advise me as soon as a decision on the contract is made?

Sincerely and cordially,

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

On February 3, 1954, Brigadier General Chorpene, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, replied to my letter. I also submit the Engineers' re-

ply to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1954.
Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHELLEY: Reference is made to your letter of January 24, 1954, relative to the possible consideration by this Department of bids received from foreign concerns in response to an invitation for bids pertaining to the design and manufacture of 14 main-turbine governors and 2 auxiliary-turbine governors for Dalles Dam, situated in the State of Oregon.

As of this writing, there has been no determination as to who shall receive the award. All bids received are presently undergoing evaluation by the district engineer to determine the bidders who are responsive to the invitation and who may be considered as responsible bidders in a technical sense. Six bids were received, as follows:

Low: Hitachi, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan	\$1,073,522
Second: Costruzioni Meccaniche, Milan, Italy	1,163,628
Third: Pelton Water Wheel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	1,314,785
Fourth: Woodward Governor Co., Rockford, Ill.	1,325,888
Fifth: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	1,347,165
Sixth: Mitsubishi, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan	1,486,202

Conforming with the requirements of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.) this Department follows a procedure of awarding contracts to the lowest responsible bidder, after formal advertisement. In a case where the lowest acceptable bidder is a foreign concern and its price, when compared with that of an American firm, involves a differential of less than 25 percent but is more than \$25,000 lower than the bid of the American firm, the regulations of this Department (Armed Services Procurement Regulation—sec. 6-105.1) promulgated under authority of the Buy American Act (41 U. S. C. 10 a-d) requires the contracting officer to submit the matter for consideration of the Secretary of the Army.

Should it be established that the technical qualifications of either of the two foreign concerns involved are satisfactory and their bids otherwise prove to be the lowest acceptable, in accordance with the Armed Services Procurement Act and the regulations of this Department, it will then be in order to refer the case to the Secretary of the Army for decision.

I trust that the foregoing explanation gives you the information you seek.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers
for Civil Works.

Mr. Chairman, this letter is of some importance since it gives the status of The Dalles governor contract at that time, and because it also contains a general statement of the policy under which the Corps of Engineers and the Army operate in considering bids on this type of contract. The Members will note the references to the Buy American Act, which Congress passed in 1933 to protect American industry and American workers from just this type of low-wage-cost foreign competition where Government contracting is concerned.

With regard to manufactured articles purchased for use in Government projects or public works, the Buy American Act requires that such articles shall be of United States manufacture with certain exceptions, including a proviso that "if the head of the department or independent establishment making the contract shall find that it would unreasonably increase the cost an exception shall be noted." Defense Department regulations arbitrarily provide that a finding of unreasonable increase in cost may be made if the low American bid is 25 percent or more higher than the low foreign bid, or if a price differential of more than \$25,000 exists. The Pelton bid on the subject contract was 22.4 percent higher than the low Japanese bid, well within the 25-percent differential. I contend that on contracts involving hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars the alternate \$25,000 figure is unrealistic in making a finding of unreasonable increase in cost, and that its use in this instance is a direct evasion of the intent of Congress in passing the Buy American Act.

On January 25 the Pelton Water Wheel Co. stated its case protesting a Japanese award of this contract. Their statement, in the form of a letter to the Portland district engineer, does such a fine job of outlining the practical considerations which should be taken into account in evaluating the relative merits of an award to American or foreign contractors that I place it in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

THE PELTON WATER WHEEL CO., INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., January 25, 1954.

Fourteen main turbine governors and two fishwater turbine governors for Dalles Dam Powerhouse—Invitation CivEng-35-026-54-58—Pelton 53036.

Col. T. H. LIPSCOMB,
District Engineer, Portland District,
Corps of Engineers, United States
Army, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: 1. This will supplement our Mr. C. G. Crawford's letter of January 18. In this letter it will be our purpose to enlarge upon the reasoning back of Pelton's protest against serious consideration by the Government of the bids submitted by the Japanese and Italian manufacturers on January 12. At the outset I want to state that this is in no way to be construed as a criticism of the Corps of Engineers, but rather as a protest directed to our Government against what we believe may be an early manifestation of a growing tendency on its part to buy equipment from foreign manufacturers which common sense dictates should be procured in the United States.

2. I shall begin by pointing out that we fully realize that the United States as a creditor nation must, over a period of time, strive to decrease the present excess of exports over imports if we are to reduce the extent of foreign aid on the one hand and obtain for our citizens earnings on their investments abroad on the other.

3. For a long time now we have listened to arguments in support of the above and agree that they would make sense where a competitive situation has been established in that our advanced production techniques and mass production facilities make it possible for us to attain unit production costs low enough to offset the lower labor costs of foreign nations. That is to say that the foreign nations should not be indiscriminately handed large contracts but should be given a fair chance to compete for them.

4. In connection with the purchase of the subject hydraulic turbine governors,

however, we contend that it is unfair for the Government to expect us to compete price-wise with foreign manufacturers since these governors are not mass-produced but rather are designed and more or less tailor-made for manufacturing on a one-off basis or, at most, in small quantities. In substantiation of this the subject Government inquiry covers more governors (16) than have ever to our knowledge been purchased at one time.

5. As Mr. Crawford pointed out in his letter, the subject tender required compliance by the bidder with the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and other legislation, all intended to make certain that the successful bidder would pay wages and maintain working conditions up to present-day standards in the United States metal trades and machinery industries. It is a well-known fact that these standards have been greatly improved since V-J Day and further that the Government itself was directly or indirectly a party to a preponderance of the gains made by labor. Pelton's costs therefore are performed based upon an average labor rate of \$2.17 per hour plus fringe benefits totaling 34 cents per hour plus an additional increment of cost resulting from overtime and other provisions which are part and parcel of the labor contracts of most American metal trades manufacturers. How then can we hope to compete with the Japanese whose total labor cost is estimated to cover the span of 20 cents to 40 cents per hour, or with the Italians whose labor cost range is of the order of 25 cents to 50 cents per hour? Significant is the fact that in any case our minimum legal wages are or shortly will be about twice their maximum wages.

6. Aside from the above we contend that it is imprudent on the part of the Government to make this purchase abroad inasmuch as disturbances in Asia or Europe might so delay, if not entirely stop, the production of these governors that The Dalles Dam powerhouse could conceivably be kept off the line for years with a revenue loss running into millions of dollars.

7. We also contend that it would be imprudent on the part of the Government to purchase these governors abroad in that the Japanese and Italian vendors do not have United States engineering and manufacturing facilities and therefore could not as a practical matter service the governors in event of operating difficulties nor supply the renewal parts that will be required over the years to come, thereby exposing the Government to costly plant shutdowns.

8. Because governors for hydraulic turbines are special apparatus requiring a background of research and development and a high degree of skill in design and manufacturing, and further because the three domestic bidders are the only established qualified builders in the United States, we contend that it is imprudent on the part of the Government from a national defense aspect to fail to encourage continuation in the governor business of the three domestic firms which are, incidentally, nicely dispersed from the standpoint of an A- or H-bomb attack.

9. In further support of paragraph 8, Pelton has built up, with its own funds, a governor engineering department and substantial manufacturing and testing facilities and it is our contention that it is unfair to force Pelton into an untenable competitive situation and thereby deprive it of the necessary business volume required to permit it to earn a reasonable return, after taxes, for its stockholders on the investment involved.

10. We also contend that it is imprudent on the part of the Government to, in a year of so-called corrective adjustment, place contracts abroad for delivery over the period July 1, 1956, through May 1, 1960. We so maintain because for all we know the United States might be in a recession or even a depression during the years in question. In

such event 100,000 hours of labor and 1,500,000 pounds of material, to come from western sources, might be of considerable significance to this section of the country.

11. Over and beyond this particular governor negotiation we are wondering about what may be happening to our associated hydraulic turbine business. This is to say that we fear that the Government will give serious consideration to the foreign purchase of hydraulic turbines as well as to governors. Since our Government purchases approximate 75 percent of all of the hydraulic turbines sold in the United States, its policy as to the entertainment of foreign bids is of great significance to the 6 domestic hydraulic turbine manufacturers. If we cannot compete on turbine governors, then in the nature of things we will have even less chance to compete on turbines. Is it surprising then that we are as much worried about an apparent buying trend as with an individual purchase? It may well be that all of this is part of a new Government procurement philosophy and if such is the case we would appreciate being advised as to what the Government has in mind for such companies as Pelton in the new scheme of things.

12. In reestablishing its governor business several years ago Pelton was encouraged by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers because it was apparent to the Government that additional competition was needed. Pelton has since gone to the trouble and expense of bidding regularly on Government inquiries and has had the low price in 4 out of the past 6 governor bid openings in which it participated, per attached exhibit A. In the face of this evidence it most certainly appears that Pelton's activity in the governor business has been valuable from the standpoint of the taxpayers pocketbook. Are we to be forced out of this business by unfair foreign competition and will the passage of time show a reversion to the situation which existed for many years during which there was but one supplier of this apparatus in the entire Nation?

13. As to this specific case, Pelton has been working on The Dalles governor negotiation for several years, attended several conferences in Portland prior to the bid opening, and went to considerable additional expense in the preparation of detailed cost estimates and a proposal. If our bid was not to receive proper consideration, is it fair to Pelton as a taxpayer to put it to this large expense?

14. In our opinion Pelton should obtain this order first because it submitted the low domestic price, and secondly because Pelton is an old, established concern with an enviable reputation for research, development, and new power-apparatus pioneering. Furthermore, and of equal importance, is the fact that the Government is in the unique position of being able to purchase the turbines and governors from one manufacturer inasmuch as Pelton and the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., The Dalles turbine contractor, are one and the same corporation. This unit responsibility should indeed be an added attraction to the Government in view of the size and importance of this power development. All of the resources of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. are back of our tender and there can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable engineer that the turbines and governors would be designed to work together and that we would be fully responsible not only for their successful operation, but also for servicing this machinery over the years to come.

15. I regret having to write so lengthy a letter but feel a joint obligation to our workers and owners to get into your hands every sensible argument in support of keeping this small but key industry alive.

Very truly yours,

W. F. BOYLE,
Vice President and General Manager.

EXHIBIT A

Date	Government agency and project	Number of units	Low bid	Intermediate bid	High bid
June 24, 1952	U. S. Army Engineers McNary Dam, Ore.	10	Woodward, \$1,017,491	Allis-Chalmers, \$1,308,745	Pelton, \$1,599,827
July 2, 1952	U. S. Army Engineers, Chief Joseph Dam, Wash.	10	Allis-Chalmers, \$437,720	Pelton, \$474,517	Woodward, \$475,619
July 15, 1952	U. S. Army Engineers, Old Hickory plant, Tennessee	4	Pelton, \$256,240	Woodward, \$310,456	Allis-Chalmers, \$400,270
Oct. 7, 1952	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Nimbus plant, California	2	Pelton, \$75,000	Woodward, \$77,952	Lombard, \$97,350
Aug. 18, 1953	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Chandler plant, Washington	2	Pelton, \$53,600	Woodward, \$64,070	
Jan. 12, 1954	U. S. Army Engineers, The Dalles, Ore.	16	Pelton, \$1,314,785	Woodward, \$1,325,888	Allis-Chalmers, \$1,347,165

The major points raised by Mr. William Boyle, vice president and general manager of the Pelton Water Wheel Co., deserve special attention. Mr. Boyle points out that equipment of this type cannot be mass-produced and that man-hours of labor, therefore, form a major part of its cost. American contractors are required to comply with the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act and other fair-labor standards legislation under the terms of the contract. I believe in those laws for the protection of American labor and have worked for them and supported them all of my adult life. I am firmly convinced that they are right in theory and intent, and that in their practical application the welfare of this country demands that we adhere to them strictly. However, no such requirement can be applied to foreign bidders. By awarding Government contracts to foreign firms we evade the laws and in effect render them null and void. Pelton pays an average labor rate of \$2.17 per hour, plus 34 cents an hour in fringe benefits. Their estimate is that their Japanese competitor has a total labor cost averaging from 20 cents to 40 cents per hour. It is obvious that even the Buy American Act, applied in its strictest terms, could not overcome this disadvantage. Mr. Boyle also raises the disturbing question of the effect of the present explosive situation in the Far East on the possibility of ultimate delivery of The Dalles governors if ordered from Japan. Certainly no Japanese manufacturer can guarantee such delivery within the next several years or until the critical tensions in Indochina are resolved one way or another.

Further, it is pointed out that servicing of this equipment will present a difficult problem if purchased from a foreign manufacturer, who cannot maintain, and would not be required to maintain, in this country the necessary facilities to do a job. Thus, the servicing responsibility would devolve on the very American manufacturers who are to be deprived of the original contract. Such a procedure is not only unjust but a continuance of the foreign-award practice could serve to drive out of business the few American firms now qualified to produce and maintain these essential pieces of equipment—the very heart of the generating system. We would then be deprived of not only original production facilities and know-how but also of the technically qualified organizations to maintain present equipment.

The Pelton Co. also indicate that their considerable investment in engineering and manufacturing this type of equipment was encouraged by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers because of the need for additional facilities in the field. If they are

not to be permitted to capitalize on this investment because of foreign competition, the United States is placed in the position of dealing unfairly with this firm and setting an example which would well result in loss of its services to the Nation. We cannot depend on these foreign manufacturers, no matter where situated, to supply us in critical years to come. To sacrifice an essential domestic industry now for the sake of a misnamed "economy," is like killing the goose which laid the golden eggs. Once the industry is dead and we become dependent on foreign suppliers, the low prices they now quote us will be a thing of the past also. Where is the economy in that?

During the period from January to early May of this year, my staff and I took part in a great many discussions with officials of the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Army, and the Department of State on The Dalles contract and on the whole general policy of permitting foreign suppliers to bid on contracts to supply heavy power generating and control units for Government power projects. In the course of those conversations it became increasingly clear to me that heavy pressure was being exerted by our State Department to assure that the contract would be awarded to Hitachi, Ltd., the Japanese firm. I found that the Department had lent its support to an official of the Japanese Embassy in conferring with Army officials on the contract award. Further, an official communication was dispatched from the Department of State to the Department of the Army, urging in what I understand were very strong terms that the Japanese bid be given favorable consideration. I say "I understand" because when I requested a copy of the letter from the Department, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, the writer of the letter, advised me that it was considered to be a confidential communication between the executive departments and could not be released to me. The gentleman, Mr. Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, confirmed, however, that he had sent such a letter.

My discussions with the Corps of Engineers left me with the distinct impression that they were unhappy over the prospect that these vital mechanisms might be purchased from a foreign supplier, and that they had been unhappy about the whole situation on power-producing machinery for some time. However, the decision to invite foreign bids on this type of equipment was, I am informed, made on a Cabinet level and the matter is out of their hands. Likewise, the decision as to whether a foreign or domestic award shall be made on any specific contract is made, ostensibly, by the Secretary of the Army. It is my considered opinion, based on many weeks

of delving into this problem, that it is the Department of State which really dictates the decision.

When this fact had become apparent to me, I arranged a conference with Mr. Kalijarvi, the State Department officer acting in these matters. At this conference it became quite clear that the Department had no intention of reconsidering its actions or its policy in encouraging foreign rather than domestic purchases of heavy electrical equipment for Federal powerplants. At later conferences between Department officials and Mr. Boyle of the Pelton Water Wheel Co., and with officials of the International Association of Machinists, whose members stand to be laid off if Pelton does not get this contract, the Department held to this position in spite of every argument advanced against it.

At this point, although it is somewhat out of chronological order, I wish to place in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Department in response to a strong protest I lodged with the Secretary over the manner in which the administration is endangering domestic labor and industry and the national security by its tactics. The letter is signed by our former colleague from Kentucky, now Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 25, 1954.

The Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. SHELLEY: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 14, 1954, in which you refer to the position of the Department of State with regard to the contract for hydraulic governors to be installed in The Dalles Dam in Oregon. You request that the Department of State inform the Department of the Army that it has no objection to the award of the contract in question to the Pelton Water Wheel Co., which is located in your district.

The responsibility of the Department of State in the matter of Government procurement contracts is that of bringing to the attention of the heads of procuring agencies such facts in the area of foreign affairs as should be taken into account in determining whether a foreign or domestic award would be in the public interest. As you know, the Buy American Act specifically provides that the heads of procuring agencies can take full account of the public interest in making their decisions.

In the case under consideration, such facts certainly include the key position of Japan as one of the most important allies of the United States in the Far East, the necessity for a sharp increase in Japanese exports in order to overcome that country's heavy balance of payments deficit, and the necessity for increasing the political and social stability of this country's allies through the establishment of strong and self-supporting economies. Closely related to these considerations is the desire of the administration, expressed by the President in his message of March 30 to the Congress, to reduce the burden of United States foreign aid through

the development of the highest level of international trade that is profitable and equitable for all.

The Department would be remiss in its responsibilities if it did not bring considerations such as these to the attention of the Department of the Army.

With regard to certain of the specific points raised in your letter concerning the desirability of awarding Government procurement contracts to foreign producers of electrical equipment, there is enclosed a memorandum on the subject which was prepared by the Department. You will also be interested to know that the rumor regarding the alleged Communist sympathies of a large percentage of the Hitachi Co.'s employees has been investigated and found to be without foundation in fact.

The Department of State is not in a position to request the Department of the Army to reverse its decision in The Dalles Dam case. The Department does understand, however, that bids for the equipment are to be asked for again. The Department has no doubt that the decision taken on such bids will be in accordance with the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Secretary Morton's letter states that when now bids on The Dalles contract are opened, "the Department has no doubt that the decision taken on such bids will be in accordance with the national interest." I wish that I had no such doubts. But it seems to me that the entire tone of this letter gives striking evidence that the Department of State, or at least those individuals responsible in this case, has gone overboard in trying to rationalize an irrational position. The national interest from their point of view has lost all contact with the realities of our own domestic situation. They seem to forget that foreign countries maintain embassies and representatives in this country who are paid by their people to sell us on their national interests, while the employees in our State Department have been hired by the American people to do a similar job for us. It is pretty clear that instead they have sold themselves on the idea that their job is to act as salesmen within the Government and to the American people for the foreign interests with whom they have dealings.

It is time that we made it plain to them that their job is to consider first and foremost the real national interest of the United States, and that destruction of an industry vital to our national defense and adding to unemployment here at home is not in that interest. Furthermore, it is not in the long range national interests of our allies to dry up the source on which they must depend for aid—the economy of the United States. If some of these State Department people would drop out of cloud 16 for awhile, from which height they can not see anything on this side of either ocean, they might learn something from the people in our labor unions and in our industries who are paying them to do a job for us. If their minds were really open to the national interest, they might have paid some attention to the representatives of the International Association of Machinists and the Pelton Water Wheel Co. who tried to give them

the facts in the situation. By their attitude in those conferences and by the statements made in this letter, the Department of State makes it unequivocally clear that this administration is acting as the advocate for Japanese and other foreign manufacturers in this instance, rather than in behalf of the citizens of the United States, whose servants they are. It also becomes clear that no alteration in policy can be expected unless Congress takes a hand and forces the issue. It is my hope that my remarks will spur action toward that end through legislation—the legislation which I have introduced. Remarks which I addressed to the House on February 9 in opposition to the Randall Commission's recommendation that the Buy American Act be repealed were intended to pave the way for such action. I cited the Dalles contract at that time as an example of why the act is needed. I hope to convince the House that rather than repeal the act, it should be strengthened, and that the importance of the domestic heavy electric equipment industry is such that special legislation requiring that Government power projects use only American-made machinery is merited by the present evasion of the act in that regard. The recent events on The Dalles contract have made the need doubly evident.

From January through early May I continued to press the Corps of Engineers and the Army on this contract. At a personal conference with the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. John Slezak, I made a special plea in behalf of the Pelton Co. and its employees. I pointed out the considerations already mentioned, and the further fact that Pelton would be forced to lay off approximately 100 of its employees if they did not receive the award to which they were entitled. Mr. Slezak listened sympathetically, but indicated that orders from a higher level might prevent his following his own inclination and the Corps of Engineers' recommendations on The Dalles contract.

During this 4-month period the domestic bidders on The Dalles contract were asked by the engineers to extend bid-acceptance time for a total of 150 days beyond the original date for an award. This time was asked to permit the two low foreign bidders to prove their qualifications and to clarify ambiguities in their bid terms. This unusual consideration, undoubtedly responsive to pressure from the State Department, was an indication of the lengths to which the administration was prepared to go to protect Japanese industry at the expense of our own. Certainly I have no quarrel with encouraging the buildup of the Japanese economy as a protection against the spread of communism there. However, I feel very strongly that this is an area in which dependence should not be placed on manufacturers 5,000 miles away in an uncertain political climate. Certainly we should not place such dependence on a Japanese firm whose employees are very reliably reported to be subject to Communist influence. I say "very reliably," despite the State Department's dismissal of the report as a rumor, since I have in my possession

copies of cables from the American Federation of Labor representative in Japan whose job it is to try and swing Japanese labor unions away from Commie control—cables which confirm that the main Hitachi, Ltd., plant is under the control of a union which is—and I quote from a cable—"Historically Communist and now follows Sohyo line." Sohyo is the Red Japanese labor organization. Is it in the national interest to subsidize a Communist-dominated labor group in politically unstable Japan when by the same action we take jobs away from 100 members of the International Association of Machinists in this country who have fought communism right down the line? The State Department people who advocate such a course should reorganize their thinking, and if they do not we should do it for them.

On May 7 I received telephone calls from the office of the Under Secretary of the Army and from the Corps of Engineers, telling me that it had been decided to reject all bids on the governors for The Dalles powerplant, and to readvertise. It was stated that—

Although the two foreign firms are materially lower than any American bids, it is considered that ambiguities and failures to comply with specifications are such that the contract cannot be awarded, and in order to be fair to all bidders, it should be readvertised.

The "ambiguities and failures to comply with specifications" were on the part of the Japanese and Italian bidders. The Pelton bid was a strictly qualified bid in conformity with the specifications.

This out-and-out display of rank favoritism cannot be justified on the grounds of public interest or as a matter of ethics and good business practice. In normal practice, if the low bid is found to be not qualified, the award would be made to the lowest qualified bidder. It can only be conjectured that heavy pressure was brought to bear on the Secretary of the Army from within the administration not to follow that practice in this case. The Pelton Water Wheel Co. is now faced with a situation, in rebidding on the contract, of having the terms of their bid disclosed to their competitors. Anyone familiar with bidding practices, particularly on this type of contract where the figuring must be very close, knows what that means. The situation is particularly bad in this case because the principal competitor is a Japanese firm. As pointed out by Mr. L. N. McClellan, Chief Engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation, in discussing foreign bidding on Bureau contracts for electric power-producing machinery before the Appropriations Committee on February 4 of this year, and I quote him:

Of course, foreign bidders are becoming smart, and they do not want to underbid American manufacturers any more than they have to. They know they have to bid on the basis of this 25 percent buy-American differential, so they have to get under that.

We have certainly made it easy for them to do so in this case. Costs mean nothing to Hitachi, Ltd., because of the low wages they pay. They know that Pelton has already figured as closely as possible on the governors contract. All

Hitachi has to do now is to remedy the ambiguities and failures to comply in their previous bid which we have so generously called to their attention, and then stick in a new figure just outside the 25 percent differential and they get the contract. The Pelton investment in engineering and calculation, and jobs for their employees, are out the window while the Japanese firm is busily at work with the blessings of our State Department.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Army's action in rejecting all bids on The Dalles contract made it quite clear that this was a matter of top-level administration policy, and that the Corps of Engineers was powerless to act according to their own ideas of what was best for the interests of the United States. Therefore, on May 14 I addressed a letter to the President in which I reviewed the history of The Dalles governor contract; pointed out the significance of power equipment procurement from the national security standpoint; and requested the President to reconsider both general policy and the specific action on The Dalles contract award. I submit a copy of my letter for inclusion in the printed RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1954.
The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent policy of the United States Government in the purchase of heavy electrical equipment for installation in power-producing plants constructed in conjunction with Government flood-control and reclamation projects in the United States has become of serious concern to me. Increasing purchases of power-producing equipment of foreign manufacture by the Federal Government now present a serious threat to domestic industry and labor, as well as raising grave questions as to the wisdom of continuing such purchases because of considerations involving the national security. I am informed that in 1950 contracts awarded to foreign manufacturers for this type of equipment amounted to only 11.3 percent of the dollar value of contracts to American firms, while by October of 1953 foreign awards had amounted to 62.5 percent of domestic awards.

You may recall the controversy over contracts for generating equipment at the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington and the McNary Dam in Oregon, both constructed by the Corps of Engineers. For several months I have been exerting strong efforts to forestall the foreign award of a similar contract involving over \$1 million for hydraulic governors to be installed in the powerplant at The Dalles Dam in Oregon. A number of foreign manufacturers submitted bids to supply these governors in competition with United States firms, under Invitation No. CivEng-35-026-54-58. When the bids were opened in January 1954 it was found that a Japanese firm, Hitachi, Ltd., had submitted the low bid; that Costruzion Meccaniche Riva, of Milan, Italy, was second low; and that the Pelton Water Wheel Co., located in my congressional district in San Francisco, was the third low bidder. The Pelton Water Wheel Co.'s \$1,314,785 bid was 22.4 percent higher than that of Hitachi, Ltd.

In discussing these proposals with the Corps of Engineers, the Under Secretary of the Army, and the Department of State, it has been my contention that this contract,

as well as others of similar nature, should be awarded to the lowest qualified American bidder. I base this contention on a number of major factors: First, I feel that our Government should take every possible step to encourage increased employment in view of the rising unemployment in the United States. Second, American industry, now apprehensive over a possible further decline in business, particularly in the durable goods industries, should be given every encouragement by our Government to prevent their taking steps to curtail their operations. Such curtailment can only aggravate the present downward trend. Third, from the standpoint of national security it seems foolhardy to place reliance on foreign manufacturers to supply equipment which plays so vital a part in maintaining our industrial potential. To illustrate this point, delivery of the hydraulic governors for The Dalles is scheduled over a 4-year period, from July 1, 1956, through May 1, 1960. In view of the present explosive situation in the Far East there can be no assurance that deliveries can be maintained from Japan at that time. Should an emergency arise, the power to be generated at The Dalles will be essential to the United States. We cannot afford to jeopardize its availability by awarding contracts without delivery guaranties, such as domestic manufacturers can provide.

The Department of State, whose views seem to prevail in these matters, has contended that The Dalles governor contract should be awarded to the Hitachi firm to bolster the Japanese economy. It is my contention that the domestic economy is deserving of greater consideration, and that the 100,000 man-hours of labor and 1,500,000 pounds of material to be used in manufacture of the hydraulic governors involved in this contract alone represent an important contribution to the electrical equipment industry in this country which should not be denied it. This is of particular importance to the Pelton Water Wheel Co., which is not a large firm and is faced with the necessity of laying off a considerable number of employees, should they be denied the subject contract.

On Friday, May 7, the Department of the Army announced its intention to throw out all bids on The Dalles contract and to ask for new bids. It was announced that ambiguities and failures to comply with specifications on the part of the low foreign bidders made it impossible to accept their bids, but that the differential between these bids and that of the Pelton Water Wheel Co. was so large as to justify denying the award to that company. This action is not only a violation of normal business ethics, but is a departure from established practice of awarding Government contracts to the lowest qualified bidder—in this case the Pelton Water Wheel Co. Continuance of such practices will have a serious detrimental effect on American industry and its willingness to continue to hold itself available as a contractor to the Government. Proof of this statement is contained in a recent similar occurrence, involving a contract to construct a 16-inch pipe line dredge for the Philippines. The Corps of Engineers likewise rejected all bids on this contract, refusing to award it to the low qualified bidder, a domestic firm, on much the same basis as in the instant case. On re-advertising, only 1 of the 9 American firms which had submitted bids on the original invitation participated in the bidding. This clearcut evidence should not be ignored. As proof of the Government's intention to keep faith with American industry, the Department of the Army should reverse its decision on The Dalles contract and make an award to the Pelton Water Wheel Co. in accord with normal practice.

The Buy America Act has been interpreted to require that where a differential of no more than 25 percent exists between a foreign bid and that of the low qualified domes-

tic bidder, an award should be made to the American firm. On The Dalles governor contract the differential was only 22.4 percent. Further, the Pelton Water Wheel Co. bid was the low qualified bid, either foreign or domestic. Under these circumstances it is difficult to see any justification for refusing to accept the bid, other than the misguided concern of the Department of State for the interests of a Japanese industry which is already in position to threaten our own economy. The folly of this move is compounded by the reliably reported fact that a large percentage of the Hitachi Co.'s employees are members of a labor organization which follows the Communist line in Japan. Favoring an award to this firm will certainly do little to combat the spread of Communist influence in Japan, one of the State Department's avowed reasons for opposing acceptance of the American bid.

Mr. President, the length of this letter is an accurate indication of my strong feeling on this matter. It is now my intention to introduce legislation in the House of Representatives which would require that all electrical generating equipment for use in Government power projects be purchased from American manufacturers. Such legislation, however, could not be enacted in time to protect the interests of my constituents in The Dalles contract. I therefore urge that you review the position of the United States Government on the general policy of foreign awards of Government contracts for electrical equipment, with particular reference to the pending contract for hydraulic governors at The Dalles Dam. I suggest that such a review should result in the award of this contract to the Pelton Water Wheel Co.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

The White House replied to my letter on June 1. I ask that the reply, significant because of its failure to discuss the specific issue, be printed in the RECORD also:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 1, 1954.
The Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHELLEY: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of May 14, receipt of which was acknowledged on May 17 by Mr. Gerald D. Morgan, administrative assistant to the President. He appreciates having your views on the buy-American legislation and The Dalles Dam generator governors contract in particular. You may be sure that the important considerations which you have discussed in your letter will be very much in his mind as he considers what should be done to clarify and improve the present administration of the buy-American legislation.

As you know, the President in his message to the Congress on the subject of foreign economic policy, dated March 30, discussed the buy-American provisions in our laws. He stated as follows:

"At present certain of our laws require that, in specified Federal or federally financed procurement, preference be given to domestic firms over foreign bidders. Except where considerations of national security, persistent and substantial unemployment, or encouragement of small business require otherwise, I agree with the Commission that it is improper policy, unbusinesslike procedure and unfair to the taxpayer for the Government to pay a premium on its purchases."

Subsequently, in the President's letter of May 20 to Mr. Charles H. Percy, president of the Bell & Howell Co., he reiterated his intention to clarify the application of the buy-American legislation.

The clarification of this legislation called for by the President requires careful study since so many issues, foreign and domestic,

directly relating to the welfare of this Nation are involved and since practically every agency of the Government is affected.

This study is now being pushed forward in the hope that clear and consistent rules for the application of this legislation can be established within the next few months.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

GABRIEL HAUGE,
Administrative Assistant to the
President.

My fellow Members will note that the White House letter fails completely to come to grips with the issue at hand. The fact that the letter is confined to vague general statements supporting the Randall Commission's recommendation that the Buy American Act be softened in favor of foreign suppliers is definite proof that either the immediate importance of this matter in terms of national security and the welfare of a vital industry is not understood, or that other considerations have caused the White House to dodge the issue. In any event, the careful study mentioned in the letter will certainly produce no immediate results to protect the domestic heavy electrical equipment industry against losing contract after contract in the months to come—nor will it do anything to prevent wedding the future expansion of our power-producing potential to the uncertain destinies of politically unstable foreign governments.

That is where the matter now stands, Mr. Chairman. The Dalles contract is lost unless drastic action is taken to forestall rebidding and to force acceptance of the low valid bid. Many other contracts on which foreign firms are low bidders are now up for award. Others on which bids have been asked are in the mill. There will be more in months to come on the many major Federal projects now under construction. In the meantime, the problem is under careful study within the administration.

That being the case, I suggest that it is up to Congress to apply the necessary remedy. In support of the need for that remedy I want to advance some basic propositions and then back them up with factual arguments. Relating those propositions to the way in which we are now operating on Government contracts for power-producing machinery, as typified by the mishandling of The Dalles contract, will, I think, impress upon the House the need for action before this Congress adjourns.

My propositions are these:

First. Abundant electric power is essential to the national defense and to the defense of our allies. It is equally essential to our peacetime welfare.

Second. To insure uninterrupted development of power-producing capacity we must have in the United States an electric power equipment industry capable of producing, installing, and maintaining such equipment, adequate to meet both normal operation and growth demands and possible emergency needs.

Third. To foster the continued existence of such an industry it is essential that equipment produced by domestic manufacturers be installed in our power-generating projects.

Fourth. Legislation is necessary to assure that domestic equipment is so installed.

Fifth. The need for this legislation is immediate.

I believe the truth of proposition 1 is obvious. However, to impress on the House how vital unlimited electric power production is to the national defense, I want to cite two authoritative statements in this regard. In June, 1952, the President's Materials Policy Commission filed its report on mobilization requirements. The report, entitled "Resources for Freedom," cited the experience in World War II on the need for rapid expansion of power generating capacity and went on to say:

In the event of another war, there would be similar need for a cushion to provide a fast increase in electric energy supply to match the upsurge of industrial demand. In coming years the expansion of generating capacity must not simply keep in step with rising peacetime demand but a step ahead in order to insure a security cushion.

Similarly, in its second annual report of October 20, 1952, the Joint Congressional Committee on Defense Production stressed the importance of electric power to the national defense. They stated in part:

Your committee has recognized that industrial production must be backed by an adequate and unfailing supply of electric power. Failure to provide the necessary electrical energy needed for the operation of the increased productive capacity would seriously weaken the country's position at a time when increased industrial strength is most vital.

Many practical factors involved in the design, production, installation, and maintenance of power generating equipment make it imperative that if we are to be prepared to meet this need, we cannot depend on foreign suppliers and must place reliance on domestic manufacturers as pointed out in propositions 2 and 3. Because of these factors it is of critical importance to our Nation that we utilize throughout our power system power equipment that is manufactured in the continental limits of the United States by American manufacturers.

What are these physical characteristics of electric power equipment which make the use of domestic production and know-how essential? Let me outline these here:

First. Electric power equipment is an engineered product. It is custom-built and designed to meet a specific set of conditions and performance needs. Each major product will be designed for the specific installation. It takes weeks merely to prepare a bid. It takes many months and skilled engineers, trained in the design, manufacture and installation of electric power equipment to complete a contract.

Second. The physical size of this type of electric power producing equipment is enormous when compared with our usual concept of electric machinery. It is the type found at Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph. The power unit horsepower rating of this type of equipment is commonly measured in five figures or more. The length or

height of this equipment will measure as much as 40 feet or more.

Third. Electric power equipment is permanently installed in powerhouses especially designed for the product. The floor standing portion of the equipment is embedded in concrete. This type of electric power equipment is disassembled at the plant and transported to the site in sections, using several flat cars.

Fourth. The equipment is manufactured for a life of 25, 50, or more years. Throughout the life of this equipment, the manufacturer performs an important and essential continuing consulting service. In some cases, the user calls upon the manufacturer to redesign certain portions of the equipment.

These characteristics of electric power equipment clearly demonstrate that—

First. The manufacturer's ability to produce electric power equipment must be proven.

Second. The manufacturer's geographical proximity to the user is of major importance.

Third. A manufacturer must have a staff of competent engineers with long experience in design and manufacture of electric power equipment and who are able to consult with the user.

Fourth. The manufacturer must be prepared to send an adequate staff of engineers and skilled technicians to a power installation in case of emergency service in order that shutdown time will be reduced to the absolute minimum.

Fifth. In ordinary and emergency maintenance and service the manufacturer needs the original design drawings. Consequently, for maximum safety, these should be immediately at hand to the manufacturer.

The importance of purchasing American-made electric power equipment is evident alone from the facts stated above. Nevertheless, I would like to offer data substantiating this recommendation by quoting from a report prepared by the Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, an American consulting engineering firm established 60 years ago and thoroughly expert in the electric power-equipment field. The report, entitled "The United States Electrical Manufacturing Industry and Its Relation to the Security, Health, Safety, and Welfare of the Country," states as follows:

Experience with equipment of foreign manufacture, drawn from instances in which American electrical manufacturers were asked to service, replace, or rebuild such equipment, clearly indicates the hazards of purchasing essential equipment from foreign manufacturers. Several cases of interest follow:

One large public utility company reports the great difficulty it experienced with a very large foreign-built turbine generator purchased a few years after the end of World War I. For a period of about 10 years attempts were made to correct defects in the turbines by the foreign manufacturer and a United States manufacturer during which period the machine was out of service about 45 percent of the time due to failure in operation or to corrective work being done on it. Eventually, and before World War II started, the turbines were completely redesigned and rebuilt by a United States manufacturer and they have given very satisfactory service since. In 1943 one of the electric gen-

erators of this machine developed defects and was rewound by a United States manufacturer who 2 years later replaced it in its entirety. Since that time this turbine generator has given satisfactory service.

EXPERIENCE WITH FOREIGN-BUILT EQUIPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

During the period of World War II and the years following it, United States manufacturers were called upon in numerous instances to supply major elements of equipment, major components, spare parts and maintenance service for foreign-built equipment in various Latin American countries because of the inability of the foreign manufacturers to provide supplies and service. Both with respect to equipment which was completely installed and operating before the war, and equipment which was on order and not delivered because of the war, common difficulties were encountered. Adequate drawings and specifications were not available to the United States manufacturers. Designs were basically different from United States designs and required special tooling and other facilities for production. The cost of providing the equipment parts and maintenance service was high compared to that which would have prevailed with United States equipment. The equipment in question was not in service for periods from several months to as much as 6 years with resultant losses to the overall economy.

The likelihood that the United States power supply could face similar emergencies because of dependence upon foreign-built equipment is evident. The consequences to the economy in this country, particularly in the event of a war, need no elaboration.

In comparing American electric power equipment with European equipment of the same type, it is worthwhile noting the following examples of what may happen to us through the policy of buying equipment from foreign manufacturers:

First. As far back as 1944, a top executive in one of our large American utility companies reported that one large utility supplied electrical energy to all types of its users at least 99.987 percent of the time. Expressed in other terms, the so-called outage time or shutdown time in the case of this utility was .013 percent. I have been unable to find, thus far, any figures which show outage time of the utility industry in the United States as a whole. I am informed, however, that outage time of more than 1 percent is considered high. The percentage of outage time in other countries throughout the world is substantially greater. Take Great Britain, for example. The British Electricity Authority reports figures that show that annual outage time in Great Britain ranged between 11.7 percent to 15 percent for the years 1948 through 1953. Such power interruption in our economy, which depends so largely on electrical energy, would be critical to our national defense program and economic activity.

Second. Four 100,000 kw steam turbine units of European design and construction were recently installed in the Richard L. Hern generating station in Toronto, Ontario. On April 1, 1954, one of these units failed mechanically, completely wrecked the generator and set off a serious oil fire. On April 5, a second unit failed in a similar manner. A third unit was down for alteration.

The fourth unit was removed from service for reasons of prudence. As a result, the entire 400,000 kw station is shut down and probably will remain so for 18 months. In the meantime, the power deficit is to be supplied in part by utility companies in Detroit and Niagara Falls. Some of the power that will be supplied from the United States to Toronto during the emergency will be produced by American-made generators installed nearly 60 years ago.

Third. At the same station in Canada a power transformer failed and later a second transformer also failed. These transformers were part of an order of four transformers which Canada built of European design. Unofficial reports attribute the failures to faulty design of the magnetic circuit resulting in a melting of the core iron. Acceptance of nine 62,000 kilovolt-ampere transformers ordered from England manufactured for another station has been held up pending assurance that these units do not have the same design difficulties. Transformers designed and manufactured by the same foreign firm which designed the Canadian units are now in this country for installation in a Federal Government power project.

Fourth. The city of Cleveland recently experienced unsatisfactory performance from a 25,000-kilowatt foreign-built turbine generator. The foreign manufacturer was unable to make the machine operate properly and American manufacturers were then asked what they could do to make the turbine operate efficiently. The report is that thus far only 20 percent of the rated capacity of the equipment has been obtainable.

These facts and these figures are conclusive practical proof of how foolhardy a policy we are now following in opening the door to foreign equipment manufacturers, and by so doing, squeezing domestic industry out. Considered together with the State Department and White House letters I have already quoted, it also demonstrates the fallacy of this administration's tactics in permitting dreamers in the State Department to set policy on matters involving a hard-headed knowledge of the facts of industrial and economic life in the United States.

There are other aspects to consider. The research, development work, and the planning services so essential to the continuing expansion and increased availability of power in the United States is supported by the sale of electrical products. Such service is not available in this country from other than the United States electrical manufacturing industry. Foreign manufacturers do not incur a proportionate share of the cost of research, planning, and development, and are, therefore in a favorable position in competitive bidding if price alone be considered.

The importance of this industry to the domestic economy, aside from national defense considerations, cannot be overlooked. The electric-power equipment manufacturing industry employs approximately 250,000 employees—a figure which includes unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled workers; clerical employees;

sales personnel; technicians; engineers; and executives. These plants and these employees are located in 21 States. In many instances the plants are a substantial employment factor in the local community, and the employees obviously contribute to the economic activity of their community through their purchases as consumers of goods and services. The employees in those plants who are laid off because some foreign firm was given a Government contract which would have kept them working for a year or more, are not going to be satisfied with a half-baked story that the public interest is being served by adding them to the unemployment rolls. Neither are their wives and families likely to accept that kind of an explanation as a reason for them to suffer a reduced standard of living while they wait for the Government to get off their platitudes and get down to brass tacks about the unemployment situation in this country. It is bad enough that the administration takes a "hands off" attitude toward doing anything concrete to initiate increased employment, but when they deliberately take action to put skilled American workmen in the street looking for jobs, as they are doing by the policy on foreign purchases of electrical machinery, it is high time that Congress should take a bipartisan hand in putting them on the right track.

The industry too is faced with difficult economic conditions. Large capital investments in machinery and plant equipment are required to enter and to stay in the business. To support these capital investments and to retain the skilled workers, trained and experienced engineers and managers, the volume of business available to manufacturers of electric-power equipment must be sustained at an even keel. Each contract awarded has considerable significance to the industry. It usually takes 12, 18, or more months to complete a single order. The number of contracts for electric-power equipment issued annually is low.

From the Government point of view, loss of contracts of electric power equipment spells reduced labor earnings and thus a decline in the employee's contribution to local, State, and Federal taxes. The manufacturer's earnings likewise decrease and his contribution to Federal, State, and local taxes likewise declines. His purchases from his suppliers also decline and have their impact on such important industries as steel, copper, and transportation.

The long-run effect of loss of contracts to American electric power equipment manufacturers must also be given serious consideration. Awards of contracts for power equipment to foreign manufacturers will, as I have pointed out, decrease economic activity in this industry and, therefore, dissipate gradually the industry's labor force, its technical, engineering, and managerial personnel, and by decreasing dollar volume of sales disaffect the interests of investors who seek a sound, healthy, and growing industry in which to place their funds. Thus, the future of a whole industry which we cannot do without is being placed in jeopardy to secure a highly problematical

benefit to a nation whose interest we would better serve by inducing them to build up their domestic consumption industries as a means of increasing their people's living standards.

Having established how important it is that American-made equipment be installed in our power generating plants, let us see why it is now necessary for Congress to act to insure that this obvious self-interest is protected. First, and foremost, legislation is needed because the Buy American Act as it is now on the books, is not adequate for the purpose. Its language is not sufficiently specific to prevent such maneuverings as I have indicated the State Department engages in to circumvent the law. Secondly, the regulations which have been set up to interpret the law, weak as it is, are apparently ignored in executing contracts with foreign firms for equipment such as the hydraulic governors for The Dalles Dam powerplant. That being the case, and with contract after contract now going abroad, it is imperative that we move with all possible speed to close the loopholes in the Buy American Act by enacting a measure which will specifically prohibit foreign purchases of heavy electrical equipment for any project in which the Federal Government has a part.

The necessity is highlighted by the fact that Federal Government contract awards to foreign manufacturers for this type of machinery has increased from 11.3 percent of the dollar value of contracts awarded to American manufacturers in 1950 to 62.5 percent in 1953. With purchases from abroad increasing at that rate it will not be long before we become completely dependent on the uncertain ability of foreign manufacturers to attempt to provide the necessary growth factor for our vital power systems. We cannot let that happen, and now is the time to put a stop to it.

That we should have to pass a law to protect American industry and American citizens from our own executive agencies is certainly deplorable. But the fact remains that the condition exists, and efforts to bring about a change administratively have failed at the highest level. The foreign manufacturers do not have to spend time, money, and research effort in developing sales forces, advertising and promotional material, and distribution outlets in the United States—items which are a heavy expense to our own manufacturers. Not content with the competitive advantage enjoyed because of low wage costs, the foreign manufacturer and his government concentrate their Washington embassy's time on closed door negotiations with State Department and Foreign Operations Administration officials. These agencies then carry the ball and act as a combined advertising agency and sales force in presenting the foreign firm's case to the department doing the procuring. This is a fine arrangement and it works very well for the foreign firm—while we foot the bill to do an American firm out of a contract and American employees out of jobs, and to endanger our own security.

Further, in submitting to this pressure from the Department of State, the Army either ignores or evades the Department of Defense directive issued on June 19, 1952, and applicable to each of the services, which contains a number of restrictions against just such awards to foreign firms as are involved here. Point 4 of the directive—Department of Defense Directive No. 4105.22—reads as follows:

4. For the Department of Defense adequately to support the mutual security program and promote the mutual security of the United States and friendly countries, it is requested that competitive bids from sources in the United States and friendly foreign countries be considered on a common basis, this being consonant with the public interest. Where one or more of the following factors exist, careful discretion should be exercised in determining the award:

A. Strategic considerations:

1. Competing foreign sources would be unreliable because of (a) limited capacity; or (b) location in an area where political or economic instability might hinder production or delivery.

2. The articles, materials, supplies, or their related United States production facilities are of such strategic importance that domestic self-sufficiency must be fostered.

3. No appreciable logistical advantage to collective security would result from maintaining or increasing production capacity in the foreign source country concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the directive states that where one or more of these factors exist, the procuring agency should exercise careful discretion before awarding the contract. However, despite the fact that on heavy electrical equipment contracts all three of these strategic considerations are present in such degree that there can be no question about it, we are placing contracts abroad right and left. Apparently those responsible have not read the directive.

Certainly Japan is an area "where political or economic instability might hinder production or delivery." With the situation in Indochina and the entire Far East what it is, we may find ourselves at any moment in a situation where we are faced with an actual war—not merely political instability. What happens to production and delivery from Japan then? Making and shipping equipment of this type is not something that can be done in days or weeks. It requires months and years. For instance, deliveries of the hydraulic governors called for in The Dalles contract are scheduled over a 4-year period from 1956 to 1960. I repeat that it is foolhardy to rely on so uncertain a source for such vital materials at a time when all of our resources should be ready for quick mobilization.

With regard to the second point I have quoted from the directive, the strategic importance of the materials being such that domestic self-sufficiency must be fostered, there should be no need for discussion. Continued expansion of our industrial machine and our mobilization potential continue to place new demands on our utility systems, both public and private. Just the other day members of the Edison Electric Institute meeting in convention at Atlantic City were told by their electric power survey commit-

tee that our power needs would be doubled by 1965 and that by 1975 electric power demands would be 3 or 4 times what they are today. Huge public and semipublic power projects must be planned and built now to meet a large part of that demand. The equipment we are buying now must be available without any question to meet not only the planned need but, more important, to assure that our power-producing plants will be in shape to provide the large quantities of additional power we will need for all-out war production. If we continue the present high rate of foreign purchases we might be faced any day with a situation where the equipment we need is built or being built in some foreign country where it will be subject to destruction or confiscation, and, if that does not happen, we would be faced with highly uncertain deliveries, to say the least. Further, we would then be cut off from the supplier for installation, maintenance, and replacement, and would be forced to place heavy demands on our domestic industry to do an emergency job on unfamiliar equipment. Our present course is certainly not fostering the domestic self-sufficiency that would be needed to meet those conditions. Every contract taken away from American producers reduces it just that much more.

On the third strategic consideration mentioned in the directive, I cannot see that any logistical advantage to collective security results from awarding contracts for electrical equipment to European or Japanese manufacturers. As far as I have been able to determine, foreign manufacturers have ample facilities for producing most types of electrical equipment, and, in any event, it is difficult to see how the further buildup of such an industry in vulnerable foreign areas would contribute a greater logistical advantage to collective security than fostering our own relatively secure manufacturing facilities.

The Department of Defense directive on the Buy American Act also lists a number of domestic economic considerations which merit discretion before making a foreign award. Among them is a very important factor and that is whether, and I quote from the directive, "the competing domestic source would be a facility or facilities designated as 'small business' by the Small Defense Plants Administration." The Pelton Water Wheel Co., which has been denied The Dalles contract, certainly falls within that classification. Again the terms of the directive are ignored in favor of the highly questionable views of advocates of foreign purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is evident from these facts that the electric power-manufacturing industry is essential to national defense, and that, accordingly, domestic facilities for manufacturing this equipment must be maintained. I further submit that our present foreign procurement policy is having exactly the opposite effect and that present legislation is not sufficient to force a change in that policy. The risks to our national defense, our safety, and our economic welfare are substantially increased whenever and each time a contract is

awarded to a foreign manufacturer. Accordingly I have today introduced in the House a bill designed to prevent such awards for equipment to be installed in any powerplant in which the Federal Government plays a part, either through appropriations, authorization, or Federal Power Commission licensing. I believe that my bill merits the support of every Member of this Congress who is genuinely concerned over maintaining our mobilization strength. I believe also that the American manufacturers engaged in producing this vital equipment and their 250,000 employees in 21 States deserve more consideration from their own Government than is now given to cutrate foreign competition. Certainly a policy which threatens plant shut-downs and drastic layoffs of employees in a time of rising unemployment should be changed in such a case as this, where the question involved is not one of freedom of international trade, but is strictly a matter of internal Government action—a matter in which, by all the laws of commonsense, our own self-interest should take top priority.

Mr. Chairman, as a conclusion to these remarks, I ask that H. R. 9696, the bill I have introduced today, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

A bill to provide that certain equipment to be installed in federally constructed or licensed hydroelectric or thermal electric power projects shall be manufactured in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of assuring an adequate supply of electric power in the interest of the national defense and the security and economic welfare of the United States, equipment to be used in producing, controlling, distributing, modifying, or rectifying electrical energy, and parts and accessories therefor, which are to be installed in connection with any hydroelectric or thermal electric power projects heretofore or hereafter authorized by law to be constructed in the United States or the Territories or possessions thereof by a department, agency, or other authority in the executive branch of the Government, shall be manufactured in the United States or the Territories and possessions thereof; except that this section shall not apply with respect to equipment or parts and accessories therefor which cannot be readily obtained in satisfactory quality in the United States or the Territories and possessions thereof.

Sec. 2. Section 10 (c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C., sec. 803 (c)) is hereby amended by adding "(1)" immediately after "(c)" and by adding at the end of section 10 (c) (1) the following: "(2) That equipment to be used in producing, controlling, distributing, modifying, or rectifying electrical energy, and parts and accessories therefor, which are to be installed in connection with any hydroelectric or thermal electric power project constructed under such license shall be manufactured in the United States or the Territories or possessions thereof, except where such equipment or parts and accessories therefore cannot be readily obtained in satisfactory quality in the United States or the Territories and possessions thereof."

Sec. 3. This act shall not affect contracts, which have been entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, for the purchase of equipment, and parts and accessories therefor, specified in the first section, and in the amendment made by section 2, of this act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands, does he not, that in this bill there are many, many millions of dollars for offshore procurement for the purchase of the products of foreign factories and labor?

Mr. SHELLEY. I understand it very well.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand the gentleman is to present a bill to the House that may correct this condition. Is that right?

Mr. SHELLEY. The bill has been introduced. It is H. R. 9696.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very fine statement he is making today. I heartily concur with him. I want him to know I stand ready to support and work for the passage of his proposed legislation.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, our committee is a very durable organization. One member was shot on this floor, and many thought he was going to die. But he did not die and he is back doing business. I take great pleasure, and I know you all will, in calling on my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], to whom I now yield 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is with pleasure that the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. One of the main reasons I was fighting to get back on this floor was to have the pleasure of participating in this debate today. I also want to compliment my chairman and the ranking members of our committee on both sides of our table for their unfailing courtesy and kindness to me, the most junior member of the committee. I deeply appreciate it.

In examining the administration's new mutual security program of approximately \$3.5 billion plus nearly \$9.5 billion in requested carryovers to be authorized, we have a right to ask ourselves whether this tremendous burden on the American taxpayer is justified—in other words, does it provide that security which its name implies?

No one should believe that these billions of dollars are the true barrier between the freedom of this country and the undeniable thirst of the Soviet rulers for world domination. As a substantiating witness for this premise I refer to no less a distinguished authority than the Secretary of State himself, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, who has admitted that it is only the free world capacity for instantaneous retaliation which neutralizes the Communist threat of mass destruction. On page 25 of our

published hearings the Secretary said, and I quote:

Now, what is it that saves the world from that—

Referring to Soviet blackmail—

It is just one thing alone and that is that it is known that the United States has the capacity to retaliate massively, and therefore they do not dare do that. And that is the only restraint, and it is a restraint which protects not only the United States but protects the other free nations of the world. . . . The existence of this power in the United States and the willingness of the United States to use it in retaliation is the one thing which is saving the world from being brought into total captivity by this blackmail threat which otherwise would be possessed by the Soviet Union.

So we hear from the lips of Mr. Dulles himself that only the American capacity for retaliation and our ability to use it, only this stands between us, and not only us, but all the free world, and Soviet world domination. There is nothing that I can find in this mutual security program that contributes to our capacity for massive retaliation.

Now the second thing I want to emphasize is the undoubted permanency of this program, even though it may be on a reduced basis. On page 21 of the hearings, Secretary Dulles stated that—

I think as long as we operate on a mutual security basis we will always have to put up money for that—

And added—

I think that this community effort, which I hope will continue indefinitely, will continually require some appropriation to support it.

Assistant Secretary of State Livingston Merchant, on page 90 of the hearings, admitted the following:

The long-term effort—

Referring to Europe—

which is required in response to the long-term threat which I have described, means we must contemplate continuing in the future a marginal element of support to our allies.

And later on, on page 365, Governor Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, stated:

Technical cooperation is the kind of program that could continue as long as there are in the world large numbers of people who are suffering seriously from the lack of technical knowledge in the fundamental necessities of human life.

I want here to go into another aspect of my reasoning why this program is one of indefinite tenure, and that is with respect to unexpended balances. On January 31 last, the total of unexpended balances was in excess of \$12 billion. Next Wednesday, day after tomorrow, the total is, as I have said earlier, in the neighborhood of \$9.5 billion. This is the total of previous authorizations which you are being requested to reauthorize for the new fiscal year, in addition to the new request for almost \$3.5 billion. Now, some of these authorizations go back as far as 1950 and 1951, due to the long lead time necessary in the production of planes, tanks, guns, and other heavy hardware of a military nature. As Governor Stassen said, this

money represents other programs that Congress has previously approved which are in the process of implementation. President Eisenhower, in his special message of June 23, also stated that the new program is in large measure a continuation of existing program. Now, I think the Congress should know two things: first, you are voting to continue previous foreign-aid programs; you are not voting for any New Look such as we received in our own defense program and which I personally feel is just as much justified in our mutual security program. Secondly, if you vote for items of heavy military hardware this year you are voting to put items into the military pipeline which require a lead time of perhaps 3 or 4 years. In other words, if you vote to authorize this new money which the administration is requesting, you are voting for money which may not be expended before 1957 or 1958. This seems to me an endless chain of authorizations and reauthorizations which could continue as long as any of us here are still in Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman spoke about the fact that this program is not a part of the New Look program. The gentleman also stated that the greatest deterrent to Communist aggression was the possibility of massive retaliation. Does not the possibility of massive retaliation exist only because we have bases in countries that are a part of the mutual assistance program?

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman can in his own time tell me how much is in the program for Greenland and Okinawa, I will be grateful.

Now that we have established some basic facts about this bill, let us take a good look at the reason for passing the bill at this time. There are those of us who intend to vote against the bill not because we are opposed to any mutual security program but because we think that the Congress should have certain information before mutual security legislation is enacted. We believe that Congress should know the outcome of the conversations between the President and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. We believe that the Congress should know what the British Foreign Secretary meant by his reference to new Locarno pacts which would not only confirm the Soviet Union in possession of its ill-gotten gains but would ask this country to guarantee them. I know that I am not going to vote for any program which would admit the legality of any Communist seizure. We believe that the Congress should be informed of the outcome of the talks between the new French Prime Minister and the leaders of Red China, as well as the conversations between those same Chinese Communists and Prime Minister Nehru, of India. For these and other reasons, some of us will vote against this bill because we believe the Congress is not in possession of sufficient information at this time to pass considered judgment.

Such delay would merely be an example of realism. Our British friends and

cousins had no hesitation in postponing any conversations on the formation of a regional pact of anti-Communist peoples of the Far East until the outcome of the Geneva Conference. Is this Government going to admit that it is less realistic in such matters than his Imperial Majesty's Government?

I would like to turn now to a look at the situation in Indochina for which we are being asked to authorize a figure of \$800 million. This figure is approximately the same as was authorized a year ago plus what the administration transferred from other parts of last year's bill. We have had testimony before our committee that it is the purpose of this Government to help the French in Indochina carry out the provisions of the so-called Navarre plan whose basic element is a long-range training program for the forces of the three Associated States, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Now in support of this Navarre plan we are reimbursing the French, in dollars, for expenditures which they are incurring in the calendar year of 1954, 65 percent of their entire dollar costs in Indochina. Now before we vote for a continuation of last year's program in Indochina, obviously a continuation because of the similarity of the amounts involved, I think the Congress should know more about what the new French Government intends to do in that area. This new government is headed by a man who said he would get a truce, an armistice, in Indochina in 30 days, or he would offer his resignation. In other words, we are being asked to vote for a continuation of last year's program in Indochina when the new French Government is obviously determined upon a very different course of action.

Speaking of France and also of Italy, two of the leading powers in West Europe, I believe that the Congress has a right to know the intentions of those two governments with regard to the question of ratification of the European Defense Community pact. The treaty to create the EDC was signed 2 years ago last month and, as Secretary Dulles himself said, it is obvious that the present status cannot continue much longer. Although the administration originally opposed reenactment of the Richards amendment, it has now agreed to a compromise version which would prevent delivery of arms to France and Italy, the two nonsignatories, while permitting them to those countries which have ratified the treaty, including West Germany. I am in complete accord with such a provision.

Turning to long-range economic assistance, we find that we are being asked to support a total of \$224 million for the Near East, south Asia, and the American Republics, 50 percent of which must be on a loan basis. I feel very strongly that the entire program of this type, which this year bears the name of development assistance, should be put on a loan basis, and intend to offer an amendment to this effect. In so doing, I am bearing in mind both the report of the Randall Commission and the President's message on foreign economic policy of March 30 last. Both of these docu-

ments advocated that economic aid on a grant basis be terminated as soon as possible. As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, ranking majority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said on June 1:

We have found since World War II that loans do not make enemies and grants do not necessarily make friends.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is an item of \$85 million in this amount for development assistance to India. No stranger paradox can be found in this legislation. According to the executive branch, we have never had a formal request for this assistance from the Government of India or from Prime Minister Nehru. India claims to be a neutral in the cold war, although her foreign policies are described by Ambassador George Allen as being in some respects 180 degrees opposite from ours. On the other hand, we have Pakistan, a brave and determined anti-Communist nation, which shows signs of becoming a valuable ally. The gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee, summed it up well during the hearings when he said on page 238 of the published volume:

Now, look at India and Pakistan. For India, our total program was \$44 million. That is fiscal 1953. In 1954, \$89 million; 1955, \$104.5 million, 2½ times as much in 1955 as in 1953. But for Pakistan, about whose position there is no doubt, the program is only two-thirds as big as in 1953. One is 2½ times as big for India, the neutral, and for Pakistan, the ally, we cut down by a third.

When we had hearings on the subject of aid to India, our able Ambassador, George Allen, gave some very revealing and enlightening testimony. He stated it to be his absolute conviction that the 5-year plan of India would proceed whether they received any foreign assistance or not. He said that it gave the Indians a great thrill to see the Chinese Reds slugging it out with the Western Powers. He claimed that the Indian people were basically friendly to the United States but was unable, at least to my satisfaction, to explain why such a feeling of friendliness was not communicated to the leaders of the Indian Government which holds itself to be democratic.

To give you a true picture of how the Indian Government representatives really feel toward this country, I refer you to the very splendid report on the meeting of the General Assembly of the U. N. last fall which was recently submitted by Congresswoman BOLTON and Congressman RICHARDS. Summing it up, in Mrs. BOLTON's own words:

I found an absolutely impossible attitude on the part of India, at every point.

Even the distinguished president of the Indian League of America, Sardar J. J. Singh, said in a letter dated May 8 last:

After mature consideration, I have come to the conclusion that aid given on a government-to-government basis is not helping to create better relations and understanding between the people of India and the people of the United States.

Concluding my comments on the subject of United States aid to India, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from the April 1954 report of the investigations division of the appropriations committee of the other body:

Program revisions under the technical assistance program in India have been made without advice to Congress. . . . This money has, therefore, been used for purposes other than those presented Congress. FOA-TCA has made requests for funds for projects which could not conceivably be committed in the fiscal year for which the request was made or within a reasonable time thereafter. . . . The people of India do not directly receive the United States contribution. . . . The people of India, for example, who must pay for fertilizer are not personally aware of being the recipients of aid from the United States. . . . It—

Speaking of this aid money—

gets needed materials to India requiring United States dollars and it is a revenue raiser for the Indian Government.

And as a final word, Mr. Chairman, I quote the opening sentence of a news despatch recently sent from New Delhi by Ian Fawcett, Reuters staff correspondent:

India now is more anti-American than at any time within memory.

There are other parts of the bill which I cannot accept. I offered, in committee, amendments to delete new authorizations for weapons of advanced design—section 105—and for production for forces support—section 122. In the first instance, we are being requested to authorize \$27 million for weapons or rather for projects which, in the words of Tracy Voorhees, Director of Offshore Procurement of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which are “things that are not proven but which we hope will prove out.” Last year there was authorized and appropriated \$50 million for this item, none of which had been expended or even obligated as of April 30. I, therefore, intend to offer an amendment to delete this new authorization but to reauthorize the carryover for the new fiscal year.

Another instance is section 122 where we are requested to spend \$75 million for manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft required by the United Kingdom. I will have more to say of this, Mr. Chairman, when an amendment is offered in this respect but, in the words of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio:

We are going to help Britain with her imperial obligations and I am extremely dubious about it.

The final comment I would make at this time on the program is the waning of congressional control over the use of this money. This is due to two major factors: the vast amounts which we are requested to reauthorize and the transferability powers of the President. In the military field alone, the executive branch came up with proposals that would have totaled nearly \$2 billion of funds subject to the transfer authority. A committee amendment of mine, which was adopted, reduced this to approximately \$1 billion. To give you an example of how this is used, I wish to quote

from the hearings on page 620, a statement made by the gentleman from Ohio:

Of the Presidential general fund of \$110 million, \$55.5 million was the amount that has been transferred and used in that fund this year. From European economic to East German food, \$15 million; from European military to Iran, \$20 million; European military to Operation Reindeer, the Christmas food packages, \$19 million; European military to the escapees, \$1.5 million. The three transfer authorizations have been used very slightly but here are some of the big changes in programs that I have noted which amount to over half a billion dollars. Here are some of the big changes that are outside the transfer provisions and not included in the discretionary fund: \$385 million for Indochina; \$100 million for the coal-steel community; and \$29 million for India's railways, steel, and so forth. Those were all done by means of transfers within areas.

Let me tell you what happened on the Indian railways. Last year there was proposed to the Foreign Affairs Committee as an illustrative program an item of \$639,000 for transportation, communications, and labor. Thanks to the transferability clause, that item as actually carried out was increased over 60 times, to \$29 million. Even Governor Stassen admitted that there had been no consultation with the committee on this change of emphasis. As the gentleman from Ohio said:

The United States Congress did not get a vote on the program that went into effect in India.

And take another example in last year's program. The item of defense support for the United Kingdom. As you know, we have followed a policy of authorizing by areas and making no specific references to any country. And again, I must quote from the gentleman from Ohio who is to my mind the outstanding member of our committee. Here is what he said last May 14, pages 734 and 735:

The conference compromised and restored \$50 million to the defense support for Europe, making the total \$250 million. The appropriation for this purpose was \$220 million. Now in none of this legislation was there any specific provision for the United Kingdom or any provision against money going to the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, there is a clear legislative history that the defense support for the United Kingdom was not to exceed \$20 million. We find in the fiscal year 1954 program: Direct forces support, \$85 million; mutual defense support, \$115 million, of which \$60 million was section 550 sales proceeds so that the mutual defense support was \$55 million. There is \$85 million and \$55 million, totaling \$140 million and there is proposed \$75 million direct forces support, which might be considered something like defense support for last year. . . . Nothing is clearer in the legislative history of this bill, than that the mutual defense support for the United Kingdom couldn't conceivably exceed \$20 million any way you figure it. It is perfectly obvious to me that the only way the Congress can prevent economic aid at least to the United Kingdom, if that is their wish, is to prohibit specifically and name the country.

My feelings in this respect, Mr. Chairman, were summed up perfectly by the gentleman from Minnesota when he said on page 738:

Here we asked them not to spend for a certain purpose and they went ahead and

spent it anyway. They still do what they want, regardless of the will of Congress. I do not know what function we serve here except to take the people's money away from them and give it to other people to spend.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that we who co-signed the minority report on H. R. 9678 have pledged our support to the President and the administration in seeking to promote peace and security. But, as we said last year and as we repeat again, “it is our firm conviction that we may be in more danger by clinging to old methods and by using wornout and discredited tools if, by refusing to question the success of those methods, we delay in reappraising the desperate situation in which the world finds itself and United States policy with respect to that situation.” Therefore, regretfully but with a firm conviction as to the correctness and basic worth of our position, we oppose the passage of H. R. 9678 at this time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, as previous speakers have indicated, we have here before us today legislation which not only embodies certain new ideas, but also is based upon provisions which have been present in legislation dealing with this general subject of foreign aid or mutual security through many past years. Having this in mind the committee has reported out a bill which has some things new and some things old. I would have to say, as I think all would who have read the bill, that from the standpoint of drafting and actual writing of the legislation, it is a well-done piece of work.

My objection to the bill is largely philosophical; I do not believe it is the kind of bill that we need at this time.

In the first place, it seems to me to continue a general philosophy which contends that the mere supplying of money or the things that money can buy will win and hold for us international friends and allies. To my way of thinking that concept has been proven to be false. I say that with a considerable measure of regret, because we have poured out many billions of dollars, and I wish we could stand here in this Hall of the House of Representatives today and truthfully say to each other that the program has been an unqualified success. The fact that we are not able to do that would indicate to me that it is entirely appropriate and necessary to examine the bill which is before us most carefully now to see whether or not it will do the things which all of us would agree ought to be done. That is, to recognize Communist aggression wherever it is throughout the world—in Europe, Asia or elsewhere—and take those measures which must be taken to combat it. Second, we would wish that this bill would assure us of friends and allies who would be with us in every proper measure to accomplish the downfall of communism.

It ought to be said further, furthermore, that there are in this bill many good things. There are elements that will provide help and assistance to peoples who traditionally have been, and

so far as we can see in the future will be, our loyal friends and allies; those who are willing to stand up and be counted; those who have been with us in the past and those who will without question be with us in the future, those peoples upon whom we can count in this great struggle against international communism. But, unfortunately, the good features of the bill must be weighed with the less desirable features. Again, to my way of thinking, the less desirable features of the bill outweigh the more desirable features.

So, from the standpoint of our relationship with other nations throughout the world, it is my contention that this bill does not accomplish what we want to do. That is, it does not assure us of new friendships and the continuation of old ones because it has been built too largely upon the patchwork, as our minority views say, of previous legislation which has not been too successful.

Now I wish to address myself briefly on the matter of congressional responsibility. Those of you who have read this bill with care will recognize in it certain provisions which give great power to several branches of the executive department in the way money is expended and in the way policies are made. I think there is in this bill too great an abdication by the legislative branch of authority which not only is its right but its responsibility. As elected representatives of the people, we have the responsibility to see that moneys are carefully authorized and subsequently, of course, appropriated, and then that their expenditure is checked so that we may know, and through us the people we represent may know, that the moneys have been properly authorized, appropriated, and then used. There is in this bill too great a looseness in the provisions tying down the expenditure of these moneys. Previous speakers this afternoon have mentioned the fact that many of these expenditures are predicated upon what are referred to as "illustrative programs" which the presentation team gave to the committee in justification of the authorizations. It was not only my observation but the observation of many others on the committee that the programs presented were more illustrative than actual. There was too great a vagueness about these programs, too much lack of detail, and too much lack of certainty as to the purposes to which funds would be put.

I believe we would be remiss in our obligation as Representatives if we were to authorize appropriations of funds on that basis. Some might say to us that the program will grind to a halt if this is not done immediately. It has been pointed out here this afternoon that such is not the case.

At the end of this fiscal year 1954 there will be about \$9.7 billion unexpended in this program, and there will be \$2.6 billion unobligated.

Much of the money which will have been obligated within the past few weeks or months will be for items which will be produced or delivered in the years ahead. I think there is no danger that we will find a lack of funds to carry on this program if we stand back and take

a long and careful look at it as our congressional responsibility would require.

Now, there are several factors today even as we debate this bill which would indicate the need for a more mature and a less hasty determination of these problems. I only need to mention a few of them to point out to this House that there are situations afoot in the world today which make doubly necessary our considered determination of this question. In the first place, there are the recently held conversations between the Chinese Red premier, Chou En-lai, and Prime Minister Nehru, of India. Then there are problems arising out of the election of the new Premier of France and the commitments that he has made relative to ending the war in Indochina and what that means to the general situation there; and, in fact, there are conferences presumably being held at this very minute in this city, the results of which have not been announced—all of which go to point out that there are facts unknown to this House without which we are asked to make a vital decision. Without full knowledge of those facts, I contend that it is difficult, if not impossible, to reach a reasoned and logical conclusion and therefore to bring out the best bill possible.

We must recognize, as has been previously said, the dangers of international communism wherever they exist. We must take steps to meet those dangers. I think every Member of this House is prepared to take such steps, but we have a right and an obligation to do the two things which I have pointed out: to discharge faithfully our duties as Members of this House with respect to the expenditure of funds; and, secondly, not to take hasty action and action that may be based upon lack of information when a delay of only a few days might make that information available to us.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a possibility of bringing before this House good and valid legislation. In my opinion, the legislation before us is not the best possible, and, therefore, I do not expect to support it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I oppose this bill for many reasons, one of which is the carryover of approximately \$10 billion.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of World War II, I supported the foreign-aid program. Then, as you recall, the Marshall plan was proposed as a substitute, due, in my opinion, to the popularity of General Marshall. The proponents of this plan stated to us at that time that we could not go on forever with the original program as it had been operating, but that we would set up a new program; that we would serve notice on our friends abroad that we would help them for 4 years under the Marshall plan. However, we were told that notice would be served on foreign countries to put their house in order because this program could not continue indefinitely. I supported that program. I supported foreign-aid appropriations until 1950, when the appropriations of \$75 million was made for South Korea.

In 1950, when we had the \$75 million appropriation for South Korea, practically nothing was allowed for military defense; it was largely economic aid. If you recall at that time the papers stated that our Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and certain of our military leaders made statements to the effect that South Korea was not worth defending from a military standpoint. We, therefore, withdrew our military strength and refused to allow South Korea the right to arm for military purposes.

Shortly thereafter the Communists invaded South Korea. It was my opinion at that time that if we pumped \$75 million into South Korea without any military protection, there was no question but that the invasion would occur. I have been very critical of our foreign policy, but there is one thing I would like to say here. I read where Vice President Nixon in a speech on June 26, 1954, blames the Indochina crisis on Dean Acheson, but at the same time praises the foreign policy of Secretary Dulles. I criticized our foreign policy under Mr. Acheson, but to save my life, I do not see how Mr. Nixon or any Member of this Congress or any American can see any difference between the Acheson foreign policy and the foreign policy under Secretary Dulles. If there is any difference between the two men, in my humble opinion, Acheson was the smarter of the two.

Our present foreign policy has not strengthened us—instead, we continue to lose friends day by day. Either we are wrong or many other countries of the world are wrong, including Britain, France, Italy, and many other countries. We cannot buy friendship. We have to date failed to gain the support of many other countries in our honest effort to maintain unity and peace in the world, irrespective of an expenditure of billions of dollars.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I had the privilege in 1943 of going to Mexico and countries in South and Central America. In 1944, our committee spent 4 weeks in Europe. Last year as a member of an Armed Services subcommittee, we covered many countries of the world. I had certain ideas before I went into those countries, many of which were confirmed. I am no expert, I assure you. Most of the experts spend about 1 or 2 days in each country and then write a book about it. They have all the answers. I do not have the answers, but I do know when the other fellow misrepresents what I consider to be the answer.

I am convinced that with approximately \$10 billion of carryover in this foreign-aid program, the greatest strength this Congress could give the President and the Secretary of State would be to send this bill back to committee and refuse to authorize another dime until we have a concrete plan of mutual cooperation with countries receiving our aid and support. Such countries, in my opinion, must be willing to fight for their own freedom and their own rights. We cannot take American dollars and force any country to fight against its will.

I want to say another thing. In my personal opinion military aid is more dangerous than economic aid unless wisely placed. If we are going to build air bases in certain countries, which I do not think best to name, we must be assured that such bases will be used by our allies and not by our enemies in the event of war. Why should we send modern machinery and equipment into one of these countries, as we did in Indochina, if these countries do not have sufficient trained personnel to maintain and operate this equipment? If we do supply this equipment to countries without trained manpower, there is no other alternative except to send American-trained men to protect that equipment and that material, or else let it fall into the hands of the enemy. To this I cannot subscribe.

This administration, in my humble opinion—and I am speaking from my heart today—has done no more than the previous administration in assisting and encouraging the training of personnel in those countries which we consider our friends and allies. What happened prior to 1946? What happened in French Indochina? You know and I know that we refused to fully support the French in their move in Indochina. All we heard then was the cry of colonialism. Let me speak my piece on that subject.

We have helped to force the British out of Burma, out of Malaya, out of India, and other places. We have helped to force the French to agree to the independence of Indochina. We have forced upon the United Nations a partition of Palestine and insulted practically all our friends in that section.

We could learn much from some of the old countries in certain respects. I say to you frankly, that with all the faults that can be found with colonialism, we would be a thousand times better off today if the British and the French were still in leadership positions, for now, after we have helped to force them out, we do not know what to do with the situation. Take India, for instance, we encouraged her independence, we gave her financial aid and assistance, yet it is a matter of fact that she is failing to cooperate with this country and our allies. Under these circumstances, how can we justify millions in this bill for India?

Consider South Korea, a country we all want to help. When our committee conferred with Mr. Syngman Rhee, the old man was woefully disturbed about our economic plan in Korea. Why? He was afraid we would wreck the economy of his country. Take, for example, the master plan for the economic recovery of Korea, which some call the New Look or new foreign policy. Mr. Harriman could never have advocated a more elaborate plan than that of Mr. Stassen. For example, the present plan did not provide homes for the common people which they could afford to maintain. The superhighways and railway plans were far too elaborate for the needs or the economy of the country.

I shall not take more of your time here except to say if America is right in her foreign policy something is wrong with most of our allies.

Again, I say if we want to strengthen the hand of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in our foreign policy, we should recommit this bill, and say to the world that unless a country is willing to stand up and be counted on the side of the free world; we shall not waste our money; we shall not go into the four corners of the earth to aid countries which may turn against us in the future.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some very eloquent explanations of the positions of those opposed to this bill. However, there is only one thing they have not explained, I believe, and they have not explained it in the 7 years of debate since I have been here; that is, What would they do?

If only the U. S. S. R. would hold still, if only the Indochinese Communists would hold still, if only the British were in control of India, if only they could stay in control of Malaya, if only the French would continue to bring "law and order," as the saying goes, to Vietnam—what a nice world this would be, say these folks. I ask them, So what? The Soviet Communist regime will not hold still. On the contrary, they are dynamically moving forward in every place where the free world allows them to move, and they are building up.

We had a debate here the other day about their economic strength in connection with the reciprocal trade bill, and its increase, the fact that they and their satellites are now almost rivaling all of the Western European complex in terms of steel production. Their propaganda of a better life for the economically depressed is phoney but it has lots of people in the world to appeal to, let us not forget that, because most of the people of the world, and I am talking now about the free world, have extremely low standards of living and are in a state of real economic deprivation. They do not believe they have nearly as much to lose as we Americans do who have a decent standard of living, even if they are offered the alternative of slavery. Many of these people do not know the difference between freedom and communism. They do not begin to understand the terms which we use in our discussions here.

Last year the mutual security program was justified on the ground that we were backing up President Eisenhower whom the American people had elected for the purpose of leading us more vigorously in the direction of world peace. This year we are backing the mutual security program in our committee because we realize, after very careful study, not by the previous but by this administration, that despite the confusions and the uncertainties and the unresolved answers to unresolved questions—which will continue to be unresolved, I assure you, for a long time to come—the United States at least has got to have some bedrock staples in a military, economic and informational mutual security program on the shelf. History marches on and the United States at least, the greatest industrial power the world has ever known and the leading rival to the competition

of communism and the Soviet Union, must have a basic program that goes on while we try to develop better solutions so that when all the confusion and all the distortion is pierced, the United States is going on in the defense against the enemy which everybody knows is communism, and we do not stop. What those here who have opposed the mutual security program suggest is—stand off and take a look and stop—when the Soviet and Communist leaders are marching on in Europe and Asia—yes, even with the danger in Central America. My dear friends who are opposing, we dare not stop. If you have a better program, let us hear it, but we cannot stop—we cannot stop unless we want to be taken over.

Now the British have handed us a proposal for a Locarno, and a Locarno could mean, as was properly said, guaranteeing gains which have been gotten illegally by Communists. Of course, the American people will accept no such thing—we want no resemblance to Munich—and many Members of the Congress, and I am sure although I do not know, inside the executive department, and the President, will have made that amply clear. You would think from the sound of it that that is a conclusive reason for our stopping this program. On the contrary, that is exactly the reason for not stopping because what brought on Munich before World War II was the fact that the British stood almost alone against Hitler in a then defenseless world. What will avoid any other Munich will be strength in the free world and that the United States cannot retreat from establishing that strength. What would you expect the British to do standing alone? Do you expect them to invite the dropping of the H bomb on Great Britain? They are 3,000 miles nearer the Soviet Union than we are. What greater earnest do the American people want that the British will stand by us and they will again fight for freedom, if they are given a reasonable chance, through all their doubts and vacillations—and this Locarnolike proposal is one—what greater earnest do you want than that our heavy bombers are based on British territory? If there is retaliation against the air bases it will be, not our air bases in the United States—but our air bases on Great Britain's soil—I do not think there can be any greater earnest of the good faith of a people than that of the British people in this situation.

There has been a lot of talk about what has been in this bill for military aid. It is true that we are maybe 10 years behind the fevered military preparations of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc which can drag on the whole slave world in terms of military preparation. And sad to say, I repeat that, sad to say, 87 percent of this bill is for military aid. Why? Because we have to catch up militarily. It is going to take considerable time to catch up. The Communist bloc are ahead of us in terms of military preparation. Do you think we are going to win this struggle with the Soviet Union—and we are sure we are going to win it—if we adopt the theory of a preventive war and are ready to

drop the H-bomb on Moscow, which I do not believe anybody in his right mind in the United States would dream of recommending? That is not going to win it. Mutual security in military terms is going to give you the security backing up and will be but the beginning of winning the anti-Communist struggle. The way we are going to win it, as we all should know, is economically, socially, and morally because we know that what is against us is not only Godless as has been truly said time and time again, but it is immoral—they even kidnap people across state lines. It is another kind of enslavement of peoples and it is not a new method of the Russians but is the same course of enslavement as Hitler took. The Communists operate on the basis of very specious but very spurious propaganda among people in the most depressed economic conditions. The real offensive against the Soviet Union and against all communism is to do the real economic job that we know needs to be done for redeeming the world. Now we are working on these programs for technical assistance with the use of some \$131 million, for economic development in this bill and for economic development with the sum of \$240 million. People talk about how we have suffered reverses and that we are not doing very well with this program.

Greece is not Communist. Greece repelled the Communists. You ask the fellows in the Kremlin if they think we are succeeding, and they may tell you about Yugoslavia, which is the greatest defection the Communists have had; superior to anything we have lost, right in the heart of Europe. Then you can ask about some of the other reverses they are suffering, like the Turkey-Pakistan pact—our new anchors in the Near East. They are in this bill. They are not Okinawa and Greenland. These are defenses which you are providing for in this bill—all of these I have mentioned.

Now, we need a little perspective. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] who opened the debate on the rule, who is now presiding, said that we had spent well over \$100 billion in mutual security and foreign assistance. One hundred billion dollars plus sounds like a lot of money, but it is one-third of the gross annual product of the United States for 1 year. The gross annual product for the United States with 7 percent of the world's population which runs around \$360 billion a year. It is in excess of twice the gross national product of the whole complex of Europe, about 250 million people.

We have enormous power, and we can sit on that power like Midas on a pot of gold, but as surely as God made little green apples we will neither enjoy the power nor will we keep it. What we can take are judicious measures for sharing that power with others in the free world who are willing to accept responsibility and keep freedom for us all, and drive back this menace of communism, the like of which man has never seen.

Now, men say that we are only using money. What do they think of the losses of the people of Korea in the ROK

armies? Losses about 3 or 4 times our very tragic own. Is that only money? What about the losses of the Greek forces in fighting their anti-Communist battle? What about the fact that three-fifths of the combined Vietnam forces are natives of Indochina? Even though economically depressed, free people of the world still love freedom and will fight for it. Why should we not be here cheering it instead of discouraging it? For what? For what considering the size of the issues and the magnitude of the powers engaged might be called a "paltry" \$3½ billion, which is something like 1 percent of the gross national product of the United States. If this is going to be our attitude you could understand it if the free peoples of the world turned us down. Fortunately it is not. Every poll shows that the American people by an overwhelming majority believe we must go forward. We must face these unresolved problems, and we do. We must face those things, but our people seem to have the good sense to feel that we must go forward in this common military defense and economic offense. I say to you that we will need more regional organizations for mutual security and mutual cooperation within the framework of the United Nations. I do not care whether they were devised by the last administration or this one. They are devised by the historical necessity of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. They are devised by the historical necessity of the United States, a history just as valid under the last President as under this one. I have enough confidence in the American people and President Eisenhower to believe that they elected him for good reasons, and it was not because he was going to withdraw from world leadership, which the United States rightfully has. On the contrary, because they felt he could bring this leadership to mature success.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman if we have not appropriated more than \$3½ paltry billion in taking care of our own armament? Have we not appropriated a billion dollars in the last 3 years?

Mr. JAVITS. We have appropriated \$28 billion this very year for our own Armed Forces, and in my opinion we would have to appropriate twice that to get the value in free-world defense which we will get out of this program. When I said "paltry," I was trying to draw a comparison. I was not being invidious to the amount on the bill. I think this is a very reasonable provision. Three and a half billion dollars is an enormous amount of money, and it does a tremendous job. I was trying to get the whole picture in some kind of perspective which I think it badly needs, in view of the way the debate has proceeded here so far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to take this opportunity to thank the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their helpfulness in the consideration of this bill. I cannot recall a single instance when we had in our committee a political or partisan vote; in all cases we had a truly bipartisan approach, regardless of politics, keeping always in mind only what was best for our country. I wanted to say that to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am deeply grateful to the chairman of our committee for those comments, I had planned to say something about the necessity for a bipartisan approach to this legislation.

It is rather embarrassing to me to follow one who is as well informed and as eloquent as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has just preceded me. I still feel like a newcomer to the Foreign Affairs Committee, because for 8 years I served on the Committee on Banking and Currency and only 3½ years ago was given my present assignment.

I recall saying to our distinguished chairman one time that it would be appropriate to change the name of our committee for we are dealing with matters that are not foreign, they are not alien—they are of immediate and vital concern. It might be more appropriate to call it the Committee on International Affairs; or, perhaps, if the phrase were kept free from unhappy connotations, the Committee on World Affairs.

Some of the decisions that we are called upon to implement by this measure were made years ago. Mutual security legislation is not a new adventure. We long ago decided that we have certain interests in the Pacific, in the North Atlantic, and elsewhere, so thousands of our young people are in uniform in those places and other thousands of civilians are in every part of the world today because we decided that America's interests abroad—military, diplomatic, economic interests—are vital. These decisions are not revocable.

The question is: In the face of continued threats to peace shall we fortify ourselves and our friends? Shall we pursue what has wisely been called the policy of deterring potential aggression by that nation which we know to be the enemy of those things we stand for?

Now, I do not enjoy speaking of evil in the world, but I am sure that it is the part of wisdom not to underestimate either the evil designs of the Soviet or the capacity of the Soviet power that has been turned loose in the world. We must, on the other hand, not underestimate our own power; and I hope, Mr.

Chairman, that the debate may be conducted without a trace of defeatism, for if the Soviets are great and powerful, so is our Nation, and we are becoming more powerful. I know that everyone in my hearing at this moment loves our country as deeply as I love it. I appreciate that there are those who hold other views and who feel strongly about them, but I hope the principal purpose of serving the security and other interests of the United States will be recognized at all times. The fact that, in addition to serving our own interest, we serve also the interest of other peoples who have the same anxieties about freedom in the world, the fact that they are served is not in conflict at all with this basic purpose of strengthening America through right relations with our friends.

Mr. Chairman, I think the key to it is teamwork. Reference has been made to the dissatisfactions that exist with some decisions of the Executive, but there can be no successful carrying out of our foreign policy except as we have good teamwork between the Congress and the Executive. I am eager as any that the Executive not invade our function, but I am also eager that we not invade his prerogatives. The framers of the Constitution never intended that these matters should be determined by legalistic decisions, but that there must be an interplay that is produced by a sense of teamwork. In this continuing problem of working out a foreign policy—and our foreign policy is not fixed; it is an evolving policy—there must be every effort toward cooperation between the Executive and the Congress.

Also that there shall be teamwork between the United States and those nations who believe with us in freedom, and who have the same general interests that we have in the world.

That does not mean that we construe their interest to be identical with ours. There are certain conflicts. There are inevitable conflicts between the economic interests of our country and Great Britain. We cannot hope to reconcile them completely, but we must avoid doing anything that is contrary to the team's interest. That should not be too difficult, for essentially Britain's security and defense interests are the same as ours.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reference to the question of teamwork, would the gentleman go one step further and say that there should be good teamwork between our own political parties?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am happy to have that idea inserted. I certainly do agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that the leadership of necessity should in the first instance come from the majority party?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. I accept the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts that we do need teamwork between the parties.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I was pleased, after hearing the gentleman's earlier discussion about the bipartisan approach, that my very distinguished friend would bring in this new phase of it, that it should come through cooperation. I think we are cooperating.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have said nothing in conflict with his statement and I did not construe the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts as offering an indictment on that score. I realize that it is a very delicate question. One almost hesitates to raise the question of bipartisanship for fear he may be misunderstood. I suppose that references to the past are inevitable, we cannot resist the temptation to speak of past events. We on the Democratic side may emphasize one feature of the record my good friends on the Republican side will emphasize another feature. But I hope and believe that when the story of postwar achievement is finally written there will be glory enough for both sides. I have not forgotten that the Marshall plan was first approved by the 80th Congress, so our friends are entitled to that pride in initiating a plan which has worked so well and achieved so much for Europe and the world. And while I am proud of Democratic leadership in this field I recognize that if we go back far enough we find lapses on our side. I recall for example that the convention of 1924 turned down Newton D. Baker's plea for the League of Nations. Both parties had tired of world leadership by that time—they reflected the mood of our people—but there were tragic consequences. I had not intended to say this, but in an effort to evaluate the matter of partisanship, to be fair about it, and to be as objective as a good Democrat can be, I make this reference and express the hope that past errors will not be repeated.

And now since I seem to be slipping into a review of the past I would like to mention three rules which I think might govern our judgments.

One is, Is it true? The second is, Is it just? I submit that some of the things that have been said about Mr. Acheson might have been true, for example, but I know of some that were not just because they did not contain the whole truth. Is it true? Is it just? Finally, is it relevant? Some references that are both true and just are out of place, because they are not relevant and do not serve our national interest. The desire to look at the past occasionally should be like the use of a rear-view mirror in a car. We use it, but only to see that danger is not approaching. Our eyes are on the road ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was construing my questions as support of what the gentleman was saying.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Exactly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman realizes that my question was based not upon the past, but only yesterday observations unfortunately were made that should not have been made,

and it would have been better if they were left unsaid, where they tried to blame the Democrats for the situation in Indochina.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I are not far apart, and I am always happy to yield to him. He is one of my leaders; he knows I am devoted to him, and I hope he did not construe what I said as varying from the proposition he advanced, that we must struggle to avoid unhappy references to the past that hinder us in developing a sound foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, when the war ended, the world was not the kind of world we had hoped for. I remember how eager we were to turn to other tasks, the kind that were closely related to the affairs of Arkansas, for example, and I remember how frustrated we felt. Instead of having a united world, we had a divided world, and we still have a divided world, but I point to the fact that at least it is an undestroyed world. A wise man said, when that comment was made following the war, that a world united would be better than a world divided but a world divided is better than a world destroyed. We have a frightened world, and it is well for us to be frightened, because when men are not awed by actualities they may fail to act defensively. Now, if I did not think that this bill, which is the product of weeks and months of hard work, added to our defense and to the possibility of deterring aggressions that would involve us, I would not be for it. My taxpayers are as burdened as those of any other part of the country. It is a proportionate burden, and all are eager to help them. But, I know if I were to take a poll of the 300,000 people to whom I am primarily responsible, if I asked "What is your first expectation of the Congress?" they would say, "Give us peace. Produce effective means to prevent war." That means giving to those people who are on our side the strength to resist aggression. It can be done with a certain amount of help from us. That issue has been presented to this Congress time and time again, and always we have voted to have strong allies. One notable statement was made by our great Speaker when he pointed out in the 1953 debate that the Turks could take our dollars and do twice as much with them in the way of getting weapons into the hands of fighting men. There are any number of instances proving that displaying strength close to the source of contagion, close to the source of present threats is effective.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. As to the point the gentleman brought out about the Turks, if we could get the proper kind of support from the French and the Italians that we are getting from Spain and the Greeks and the Turks, it would be a wise investment of American money. But if we pump billions of dollars into these countries and then have to wait patiently for 4 years for them to participate with us in the defense of Europe, it

is questionable in my mind whether or not this is a wise investment of \$3½ billion.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Let me talk to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. He has lived with this problem of military preparations. Surely he does not think that only American soldiers, only American seamen are capable of defending freedom. We accepted the help of the French when we were fighting for our own freedom. The French have not changed essentially. They still love liberty. Humankind is pretty much the same the world over. Even the enslaved Chinese whose aspirations were described to us by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in this Chamber—when he said in substance, "What are they looking for? Pretty much the same things we are." But the French particularly are individualistic. They know what would happen to life if regimented by Soviet tyranny. That is the reason the Frenchman fought in the underground. That is the reason he fought so furiously to regain an opportunity to fight and die for national independence.

Every informed military man I know brings back the word that the French are important factors in our first line of defense. They are regaining military strength and they are regaining the spirit that must accompany physical strength.

The French have suffered in Indochina. The French provided the soil upon which two cruel aggressions took place in one generation. But the French farmer loves his little farm as much as Pennsylvania and Arkansas farmers love their farms. The Frenchman will fight for liberty and we very much need him. He desperately needs us and here we have the heart of mutual security legislation, Mr. Chairman, recognizing the common interests.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield, but briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly I agree with the gentleman. And we have appealed to the French and Italians for 4 years to participate with us in the EDC program. We in America, too, have made tremendous sacrifices; in World War I and in World War II and then in Korea with 120,000 to 130,000 casualties. So let it not be said that we have not participated with our full strength and men and materials in these European and Asiatic wars.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. But the point that I am trying to bring out is this. We have sent our armies into all parts of the world without question, to suppress these dictatorial tyrants who periodically arise in the affairs of the world and to preserve liberty and freedom in the world. But now we come to this statement of agonizing reappraisal that Secretary Dulles refers to and to consider the question of German participation under the NATO agreement and under the EDC. Does the gentleman know what I think? Twenty-five divisions of Germans on the line in Europe would do more to stop the Communist threat and to stabilize conditions in Europe and in the world than

anything else we can do. What we need to do, I will say to my friend, is to build on strength and not on weakness. If we were getting the same support from France and from Italy as we are getting from Spain and Greece and Turkey, we could build our defenses to meet any demands that may be made upon us. So let us not overlook immediate consideration of German rearmament.

If the gentleman will permit this last thought: The Germans will fight if necessary, and that is why we should be interested in their immediately being taken into the EDC. Twenty-five German divisions will be a great contribution to building defense of Europe and bringing peace and stability in the world. It will distract the attention of the Russians from the Far East, give them something to think about and bring about a situation that may ultimately turn this war-torn, chaotic world to peace. But let us bring the Germans into EDC if they are willing to join with us. Otherwise we will eventually find ourselves out on a limb and if trouble starts we may have to go it alone with but few friends that I have mentioned joining us.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am sorry, but I cannot yield further.

I am glad to yield to my friend, but he realizes that he interjected a new element into the discussion, and that is the question of German rearmament. He is aware of the fact, I hope, that there are provisions here designed to encourage the ratification of the EDC by France and Italy.

Mr. GAVIN. It is about time.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman knows that many of us who fervently support this bill share some of his irritations, yet all this is a part of the hazard of living under free governments.

One monumental thing about our country's history is that we have never undertaken to dictate to other nations. The provisions here are not in the nature of dictation. In this powerful yet inspiring position in which we find ourselves today, that of the free world's leader upon whom so much depends, we adhere to this ancient tradition. Let each nation make fateful decisions for itself. We rest the case upon that principle.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I know of no greater privilege than that given me of following the gentle gentleman from Arkansas, whose magnanimity extends a mantle of kindness over our discussions in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and without whom I am afraid we might sometimes miss some of the depth and meaning of the discussions which we hold.

I come here today under no delusion or illusion, either one, that anything that I may say will change a single vote on this bill. I am 1 of the 4 who signed the minority report, signed it, I might add, reluctantly, because if I could have brought myself to believe that what we are trying to do so earnestly would be perfected by this bill, I would have cast myself this year with the majority

in the name of national unity in a time of crisis.

The fact that I did not do so simply bespeaks my own faith that the President, if in fact he so much as ever knows what I say or how I vote, would rather have me bespeak my conviction and stand by it.

I happen to be the person who last week introduced in the Foreign Affairs Committee a preferential motion asking that the final debate, the entire decision on this bill, and the ultimate reporting of it to the House, be deferred until such time as the administration should have perfected and announced to us its projected course in Indochina and southeast Asia, following announced conferences with Great Britain and decision by France on Indochina. I did not feel that was a step backward. I did not think that it was a step indicating any lack of faith. I thought that the suggestion made great commonsense.

You may remember that I said here during my first year in Congress that this country had grown great because it had based its aims on human freedom; because it had developed the greatest productive system in the world; but always and primarily because when we needed it we had found in ourselves a hard core of commonsense. We need that commonsense today.

But we need more than that. I did not think that a vote to defer discussion and action on the floor until such time as we might know even if more, in fact, might be needed than was asked could be harmful, as there are \$10 billion of unexpended funds, \$2½ billion unallocated—and we have been told that if we voted not one penny more the program could go on for 23½ months. Furthermore, everyone in this House knows that we could have carried through the program by continuing resolution beyond June 30. It seemed wise and necessary to see the future course before we arranged the authorization for the passage. Five Members so voted.

But that is behind us. The legislation is before you. I wish to speak to you very simply about the proposed bill, so simply, in fact, that you may wonder why it need be said. In short, I would like to tell you very plainly why I think this legislation is not good enough.

I know that it would be possible, as many have done today, to make a very creditable case about the size of the bill, the burden of its expense at a time when our national debt is pushing relentlessly through the debt ceiling of \$275 billion. I am not concerned about the size of the bill primarily: I would vote many times more than that amount, if I thought that it would infallibly bring the peace and security which we are seeking. I do not think that it will or can. I am worried likewise about the delegation of congressional powers and particularly the delegation of congressional authority over the purse even to an Executive whom we love and trust. Nor is the major cause of my disturbance to be found in certain signs of maladministration, for I would remind the committee that when you have a project as big as this, to attempt to control it is like trying to put your hands around a cloud. The very

magnitude of the program breeds and I think, partially though inadequately, excuses some of the mistakes that have been made.

What I am concerned about is something else. I sense that we have not yet come to grips with the psychological problem, that signal problem of what is wrong with a world which is hungry for peace, a world in which we have spent over \$140 billion some say \$160 billion—a world in which we have poured out American blood in three World Wars within my adult lifetime—a world for which we have been trying to do and a world with which we have been pleading for the last 8 years to join us. Join us—why? In an effort for peace. I would remind you with more sorrow than I care to express that we are further from that peace today than ever before. You may say that that is just like driving down a blind alley and getting nowhere, but I rather think and I want to point out to you this *pons asinorum* is a problem that we have to face and meet not with dollars and material grants, but with prayer, foresight and understanding.

The present bill springs from no new appraisal, offers no new approach, and relies on "worn-out tools" and sterile methods.

I think this program has failed, first of all, because we have not put into it true mutuality. I tried to introduce in committee conditions of eligibility for title II, not because of a desire merely to restrict but because I learned last year in Asia that people can best share your problems and stand by you if they think that they are making some element of contribution to the effort. If we are to get the free world to work with us, we have to plan even with economically undeveloped peoples to guard their self-respect by letting them know that they are giving something in return for what we are giving them. I think in terms of one of the great young ministers of Burma who said to me: "Mrs. CHURCH, go home and tell your people not to offer Asiatics something for nothing. We are not used to getting something for nothing. We who know how much we need it, cannot accept it for our people. We lose face ourselves when we take it. They think there must be a string attached." It is time that we offer some conditions of eligibility and acceptability when we give anything, since we know ourselves that a gift given in a manner that guards the self-respect of the recipient produces a better friend and one more apt to stand with you.

I think that we have to do something else. We must be very clear-cut in these dark days as to drawing the line between those people who stand with us on principle and those who do not even seem to understand what we are talking about. I am not sure that that is not the crux of the whole problem. Parenthetically, I would say to you that I would vote for certain features in this bill. For instance, I helped, I am glad to say, to defeat a motion cutting down the requested appropriation for pure and specific technical point 4 assistance. I think that kind of assistance is in line with what this country stands for, and will help to

accomplish its purpose and give meaning to our effort.

But I think this: We have a duty to be very careful when we send armaments racing throughout the whole world and put jet planes and guns and instruments of our own destruction in the hands of others with even a faint trace of lack of discrimination. That is a very great responsibility. In fact, I tell you I sometimes almost recoil from the fact that a nation which 2 weeks ago wrote the words "under God" into our oath of allegiance has had to take upon itself the arming of the world with such resultant possibility of our own destruction and of the very annihilation of our civilization. As I said, I do not think that this bill sufficiently differentiates between true allies and those for whose friendship we still bargain with wistful hope.

Basically, the bill—and the program—still seems to fail to make an adequate psychological approach based on an understanding of what it means to be free. I do not think that we can go out successfully to people and ask them to stand behind us, saying "this is what it means to be free" when we ally ourselves with nations which in their minds are still adopting a colonial policy. I do not think furthermore then we can go out and say to people, "Come along with us. We will arm you," unless we are willing to tell them what as a country we ourselves are going to do if they fall prey to Communist attack.

To me, the ultimate question then is not what all these little countries whom we seek to arm are going to do—but what course, as a nation, we shall undertake to pursue, and on that course should be based the consideration of authorization in this bill. How can you ask countries around Communist China to stand up and accept our arms unless they know what our intention is? Is it not time to make a firm appraisal of our own strength, our own courage, our own purpose? Can we in honesty ask other countries to arm, as open prey to Communist resentment and aggression, without even a pact among themselves for mutual defense? Such appraisal of our course, and theirs, should be taken before we pass this bill.

What do I mean by "freedom"? I think that there is power in the very word. It should not be necessary to explain it to any American. But strange things are happening. I think that you heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], in his interesting discussion today, tell how impossible it was to get parts of the Constitution written into this bill. I would say that I have been more shocked in recent days by refusal to permit consideration of quotations from the Declaration of Independence on the ground that certain clauses were "inflammatory in this day and age." I would remind the House that we need something inflammatory if we want to save the world. I do not think that there is any hope for us here or any hope for us abroad or any hope for the war-torn world except by persuading people somehow of what it means to be free. I think it is our weapon. I think we must accept it vigorously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. CHURCH. If we cannot sell that idea and what it means to be a free people, with a capacity for self-government and determination of their own futures, the right to live as they please, the right to worship as they please; if we cannot build into that concept of freedom a reverence for life; if we cannot build understanding of freedom into our allies so that they know that any attempt to control freedom is outmoded and dangerous—then there is no hope for us. You may say that this is sheer idealism, and deals only with "intangibles." I would say to you that in times of crisis, it is only the intangibles that bear any semblance of reality or power. As far as I am concerned, though we might vote billions, though we might put in economic supplies in many places, it will not be enough. It is not enough to give people something to fight with. It is not enough to give people things to live with. I think that you have to give them something to live by.

If we fail to make the dynamic endemic force of freedom a living thing throughout the world, there is not any amount of money that can either stay the damage or help us pick up the pieces. Does this mean that I would go it alone? I am not as foolish as that. I have spent the last 2 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee, trying just to learn. I have flown to the NATO airfields. I have gone nearly 31,000 miles in Asia. I came home humble, recognizing—particularly in Asia—a passion, among nations and people, to be free. We must persuade them that we want them to be.

I would repeat to you that this is not a world today which can be won or defended just by force. It is not a world which can be won just by material aid, or by a combination of the two. It is not a world which can be won in company with allies who blind themselves to the rising surge for independence. The situation can only be met in company with allies who share our indictment of Communist practice and aggression, and who will willingly join our crusade for human freedom. It is a world in which there is reverence and search for independence. If we can sell assurance of our own respect for their right to freedom to the people behind the Iron Curtain, or to those on that dangerous fringe, and tie in with it a deep-seated feeling that miracles can still be wrought, then I think we have a chance.

I am hoping still that we will stand aside, take a long look, a fresh perspective, and come up with a plan and a program of offering peoples such freedom as will bring us and them eventual security and peace. It is the only kind of world in which we can live or want to live—indeed, the only kind of world which will long remain for man to live in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, you know it is difficult to secure any time from the Committee unless you are in complete accord with them. I wonder if I could have 5 minutes from the Democratic side.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I will yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friends on each side for having given me 5 minutes. I greatly admire the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], although I do not agree with them at times I have great respect for them.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here 12 years and I have heard some very great speeches, idealistic speeches, dramatized and emotionalized, of the great need for leadership and participation in the affairs of the world. The grave responsibility we are charged with to bring peace and stability to the world; and there have been some fine orators past and present. Some have impressed me; in fact, the first speech I heard on UNRRA impressed me so much I voted for the first UNRRA bill, but then when I observed UNRRA in action—what they were doing, the maladministration, why I might say I have never participated in any foreign spending since; so my record is pretty well known.

At the present time our Nation owes about \$275 billion. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. We owe 275 thousand million dollars that the American people by the sweat of their brow must produce the money to pay in some form of taxes to pay this debt.

And I remember when these foreign-aid programs started: every other year they changed the name and technique as they realized the American people might rebel. When started they were going to be for only a year, then 2 years, 3 years, until now it is very indefinite, now they are telling you they do not know when they will stop; and as the gentlewoman from Illinois stated, they now have appropriations that will carry on these spending programs for the next 23½ months; so with another \$3.5 billion they are asking for will be enough to carry them on for the next 3 years. They always fortify themselves with plenty of money to carry out their program of foreign-aid spending. A great merry-go-round which is burdening the American taxpayers.

I sometimes wonder why we in the Congress cannot become practical, just a bit realistic. It is all right to be an idealist, but somebody must pay the bill. That has been our policy down over the years. In World War I, which I recall, I actually thought we were fighting a war to end all wars, to make the world safe for democracy; that was the slogan, and I actually believed it. Then after World War I, we sank our battleships, destroyed

our fortifications, and we put our trust in treaties with people whom we thought were as right-minded as ourselves. What happened?

What did we do? We paved the way for the Lenins, the Trotskys, the Stalins, the Mussolinis, the Cianos, the Hitlers, the Himmlers, the Goerings, and the Goebbels to rise to power, so we had not learned any practical lessons; we fought through World War II with tremendous loss of lives of our fine American boys. Now if we had been practical and realistic after the war was over, we would have maintained our strength and national defense. But no, we demobilized our Army, we cut back our airpower, we cut back the Navy, we skeletonized the whole defense setup. Russia was sitting on the sidelines observing, patiently waiting for us to tear down our national defense and then they would move in on us to cause us plenty of trouble, which they have been doing. So after our demobilization, after we skeletonized our whole defense, and the Russians started to move in on us, they started to get tough with us. Then we again became concerned with building up our national defense. Suddenly we were involved in Korea and for lack of materials and equipment we were nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating experience in our history. We had to fight in Korea and look after building up our national defense, and we turned in a magnificent performance of which we can well be proud. It is my opinion that our defense program is coming along fine; we are not as strong as we should be; nevertheless we are making good progress and will continue to make progress.

I would like to be an idealist; however, I think that we must be practical and realistic.

They are talking now about cutting two divisions of infantry and armored forces in our Army, I think that is a very dangerous mistake. We should be strong, we should remain strong—build the greatest national defense we have ever had to meet any demands that may be made upon us any time, any place in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in Europe 5 or 6 times since 1947. I have looked at it carefully. I have watched the different countries. I have talked with the people, I have seen their attitude, their thinking, and I think I am in a position, too, to express my opinion as to what should be done in the way of foreign aid. I do not think you are going to save the world by this constant pitching in of billions of dollars. If the spirit is not in the people who are participating with us, we cannot save anything.

What we should do is to build on strength and not on weakness. But we seem to think that by pouring billions of dollars around the world, billions of dollars every year, that we are going to get the support and cooperation of these people. The world is in just as much of a chaotic condition today as it was in 1946. After we had put in about \$60 billion, or sixty thousand million dollars, well, we are going to put in another three and a half billion and maybe the French and the Italians, if we put a little pres-

sure on them, may come around. I do not think they will. If I had my way about it, I would put my money with Spain, with Greece, with Turkey, and with Germany, because you cannot tell, if we are suddenly catapulted into a war, if these countries where we have been building up military strength would actually fight. Maybe they would, I am uncertain but I would not be taking any chances. The Germans will fight. When they had that little upset a year ago and the Russians moved in on them, you saw pictures of the Germans standing up hurling bricks and cobblestones at tanks. What do you think they would do if they had equipment to fight with? What we should do in this agonizing reappraisal is consider rearming Germany because of the fact that if you do not, one of these days the Russians are going to come along with a plan for the unification of Germany and the Germans are going to take it because they want their country united and they can get no action from us. They have waited for 4 years for us to do something about giving them an opportunity to reason. They may rearm without our help if we continue to stall. They are requesting us, their leaders are waiting on us, their future depends on being rearmed, but our dilatory tactics will eventually, I believe, chase the Germans away from us. If they do tie up with Russia and Russia gives them a chance for unification, we may find ourselves out on a limb without a friend anywhere in Europe—we will have lost a great opportunity to build up defenses in Europe against Communist aggression.

So, in this reappraisal, let us forget this idealistic talk, all this glorious talk that we hear, that we have been hearing for many years, that we can stabilize and bring peace to the world by pouring out billions of dollars. Let us get down to good, sound, commonsense. If we can secure a good member on our team that actually will stand up and fight, that is anti-Communist and we know he is anti-Communist, why do we not take him, because when we do take him and build up EDC including Germany, I am satisfied you will stop up this communistic menace, this communistic threat, because the Russians will be concerned about one of their main lines of defense in Europe and they will not be able to give as much attention to promoting trouble in the Far East. But, no, we have to appease these various countries with which we are allied. We have been appeasing them now for years, and we have an element in the State Department that thinks we have got to handle this matter diplomatically by appeasement with dollars so we continue to pump billions of dollars around the world feeling that we can save the world in this manner. My friends, it will take more than dollars; it requires the spirit of the people of these countries if we are to rid the world of this Communist threat.

I feel we ought to become practical minded for a change. Let us forget about saving the world. How about saving ourselves? If we continue the way we are going with our idealism we will ultimately end up in bankruptcy and we

may have some difficulties ourselves. How about our boys who have gone willingly forth in two world wars and in Korea, through the cold, heat, filth, fatigue, misery, and mud of mechanized warfare? If we can secure the cooperation of a country like Germany to build up 25 divisions to participate in European defense and cooperate, work with us, against this communistic threat there would be no hesitancy on my part to have them form the defense setup.

I was in Spain last year, and I found that the Spanish people are a friendly people, ready to cooperate with us, they want to work with us, they will do anything and everything they can to be helpful in this defense setup. They are our friends. It took us almost 4 years to convince the State Department that here was a bastion, here was a stronghold, here was a people that had a million casualties in the Spanish civil war, fighting the Communists. Here was a country with four or five hundred thousand infantrymen, trained, ready for action, and yet we had to wait for 4 years for the State Department to make up their minds to cooperate and work with Spain, the greatest military stronghold in Europe. Yet we could not get the State Department to go along because we were appeasing these other countries and we might offend them, so we lost 4 years in building up defense of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be practical minded. I think we ought to be realistic. I think we ought to use good, sound commonsense and spend our money with the people who are our friends and not with those that are questionable and problematical of the position they would take in the event of an emergency anywhere in the world.

So, today, in the short time that has been allocated to me, I cannot hope to cover this subject matter as I would like to, but it is about time we wake up and realize the tremendous possibilities in immediate rearming of Germany to participate in the EDC program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Permit me to say, let Secretary Dulles immediately give us the encouragement by publicly announcing that he intends to reevaluate the whole situation, reexamining the whole picture, and take into consideration those people who want to participate with us in the defense of Europe and not continue to pump our money into the countries that are questionable, whether or not they want to participate, and questionable, in my mind, as to whether or not they would participate and fight if an emergency should arise or whether we would have to go it alone after spending some 60 billions of dollars to rehabilitate these countries and build up their defense. Now, somebody has to make up their minds in France and Italy, one way or the other. They have to make up their minds to cooperate with us, or they will cooperate with somebody else, I hope that they make up their minds and make it up quick, because the

American people have been patient, they have been tolerant, they have been generous over the years contributing billions of dollars to pump into the economic life of these countries for rehabilitation and the well-being of their people. Now let them show their friendliness to us and say, "Yes, we will join with you in EDC and join in the defense of Europe in an effort to bring peace and stability to the world."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything during general debate, but there seems to be so much misunderstanding and misapprehension about this entire mutual-security program, I feel that I should try to help clear up these misapprehensions.

We have heard on the floor today that it is a giveaway program. That is not true at all. This is a program intended to insure our own security. In the process of assuring our own security, it is true that we hope we are insuring the security, not necessarily of our friends, but of the free peoples everywhere, the peoples who are opposed to communism and who are willing to join us in an effort to defeat communism.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you first about the real nature of the threat that we are facing. Do not minimize it, because we are in a struggle, a final struggle, for civilization and freedom. Do not make any mistake about it. This is it. We do not know how long it is going to last. Our President has said that it may go on for 40 years. I hope he is mistaken. But it may go on for 5 years or 10 years or even 40 years. It is a life and death struggle, a struggle for our very existence. We are playing marbles for keeps. Let us think about that as we go along with this debate. And let us forget partisanship.

Right here I want to say that the chairman of our committee remarked the other day after we had completed work on this bill that, as he recalled it, not a single vote in the committee had been along partisan lines. I think that is true. It is sometimes hard to maintain this attitude when certain things are said by those high in the present administration, which reflects upon the patriotism and good faith of the Democratic Party. But I try to put those things aside as I think we all should as we discuss this bill which is of such supreme importance not only to us but to the entire world and to civilization as we know it. I do not think we can emphasize that too much.

This struggle is of a twofold nature. Of course, it is a military struggle, but it is more than that. The menace is twofold. There is the military menace which is the menace of Russian imperialism. We fight that menace with our military strength. That is why we give military aid to our friends to meet that menace. Let us keep the distinction in our minds, that we have this military threat and then we have the threat in the world of ideas. This is a struggle not only for territory, but this is a struggle for the minds and the hearts

and the wills of men, just as the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has so well said. But she has gotten confused and has not kept in mind the fact that this threat is of a dual nature; it is military and it is also in the field of ideas.

We must be strong in America if we are to meet this military threat of Russian and Chinese aggression. We must stay strong and we must keep our friends strong. We must keep strong those nations of the world who are on our side. We propose to keep them strong, not for aggression but for their defense if they and we are attacked. Somewhere in the Bible—I am sure they are Christ's words—it is said that those who are not against us are for us. That is true in the world today. Sometimes we think some of these people whom we have helped are no longer our friends. We may think they have turned their backs upon us and that they would not support us if it came to the point where we were attacked by Russia or China. But that is not necessarily true.

Some question has been raised about whether or not France would fight. I was impressed with General Gruenther's testimony when he was before our committee. Somebody asked him that question. He said, "I am firmly convinced that the French people will fight." And he said something else, too; and make no mistake about it, he knows what he is talking about. He is, as you know, an able, a brilliant, and a devoted servant of the United States. He is right on the spot and he knows what is going on. He said that France will fight and he said further—and I do not think I am disclosing anything secret; if I am, I hope the chairman of the committee or somebody will stop me. I was very much impressed with what General Gruenther said. He said that Germany's strength is vitally important to the free world in this struggle but that France's support is still more vital.

We must keep France strong; we must keep France on our side. Do not sell France short. We thought when the Laniel government fell it was a catastrophe, but somehow this man Mendes-France seems to have caught the imagination of the French people. While he may make a settlement in Indochina that is not what we would like, it seems that he is determined to have a settlement there in order that he may bring order out of the chaos that is in France today and come to some agreement with the Western World about how we shall meet the challenge in Europe. Apparently the people have rallied behind him because he is a forceful man and has stood for something. He has been willing to speak out and appeal to his people, and has challenged them to help him bring order and dignity again to France. They are falling in line behind him and France is not dead by any means.

Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, also made a strong impression on the committee. I recall what he said about France. He said that France is like a person who has had a nervous breakdown. He said France has been our friend since the time we won our independence. Shall we, he asked, abandon

France now? It would be like a man who had lived for years with a woman he loved, and then abandoned her when she had a nervous breakdown.

It looks like France is recovering, so let us not sell France short.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I recall some testimony as to this question of France's exertions in the defense program. I recall a comparison, for example, between the salary and emoluments of a French colonel with 30 years of service in a high executive position, and one of our American sergeants who is an aide to one of our own officers. They get the same pay. We do not think the American sergeant is overpaid. We are not able to do what we would like to do for our fighting men.

Mr. LANHAM. The sergeant would probably agree with you.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. We would both be right.

Mr. LANHAM. I think so.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. But the point is that the French Government, even devoting a high percentage of its gross national product to defense, is unable to provide a higher scale than that for its fighting men. But France, according to every index I have seen, has done its share in making sacrifices for our common effort. It seems to me we might put the emphasis on that side as well as our own sacrifices sometimes, because we look in vain at some of our comments to find an appreciation of what the French have done.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I refuse to yield. The gentleman has had his time. I have great respect for the gentleman, but he can get more time.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman the feeling is mutual.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to say something else about the situation in France today and the position which France holds in Europe. France realizes that Germany must be rearmed. What France objects to in EDC—and I am not saying she is right because I think she is wrong and we are right—is really the political integration of Europe, and the loss of her sovereignty. It is just as though it were proposed to us that we give up our sovereignty and join in some sort of world government. France has gone along with integration in the industrial field, and we have a sort of industrial union over there of France and other nations on the Continent. England will not join any political union with the continental countries. Why should we find fault with France because she takes the same position that England does? We think she is wrong, but they are willing to go along with the rearmament of Germany and they are willing to go into some sort of arrangement there if it does not mean that they have to give up their sovereignty. Americans have believed for a number of years that Europe would be better off, if it were united politically as well as in-

dustrially. But, the trouble with us is that we think when we make up our minds, we ought to try to impose our views upon the peoples whom we are helping. There is in this bill a provision which was known originally as the Richards amendment. It has been modified so as to apply only to those nations who have not joined EDC. Under the provisions of that amendment, we cannot help France any further unless she signs the EDC agreement and gives up her sovereignty and becomes a part of what might be called the United States of Europe. I do not think we ought to hold that sort of threat over the head of France. I am opposed to that provision of the bill. I know the State Department has accepted it, and that it is no longer a question at this time, but I am pointing it out to illustrate to you what the situation is. What I am trying to say is that our friends will cooperate with us, if we simply do not try to cram things down their throats and impose our wills upon them. I say to you that this program is necessary. It is necessary from the military side. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has said, there is too much of it being spent for military end items, and for military support. It has come about that we do not any longer want to say anything about aid—any aid—except military aid. The trouble is that we, in America, have come to depend too much on our military might and upon our wealth and our money just as the gentleman from Illinois has said. I think we ought to spend more for other things than military aid and military end items. But the distinguished gentleman from Illinois forgets that while we are trying to win the hearts and minds and wills and souls of men, we have to keep them strong. We have to make them strong in a military sense so that they can defend themselves. We have been losing in this struggle both in the military struggle and in the cold war. Are we going to quit now? Are we going to quit now and just throw up our hands and surrender? I do not believe we are going to do that. I believe we are going to do everything possible to keep strong all the peoples of the free world who are on our side or who can be won over to our side. I believe we are going to give aid to the peoples of the world whose standards of living are low—even India. Some have said that India does not want our help, but I say to you that India is on the fence at this time—as India goes, so will go Asia and so will go civilization in Asia. If India goes Communist, make no mistake about it, we will be surrounded by communism and America will have to become an armed fortress. How are we to win India? I think in the first place we have an ambassador there who knows the situation in India and knows what is necessary to try to win the loyalty of the people of India in spite of the fact that their leadership sometimes appears to be opposed to us. But, the trouble with the leadership in India and in other great areas of the world is that this thing we call communism has a strange attraction for underprivileged peoples. It inspires enthusiasm in its converts just as our democ-

racy did when our country was young. Then democracy had an appeal for men and fired their imagination and won their support and enthusiasm. It inspired them as does a strong religious faith. Today, for some strange reason, communism inspires its followers in the same way.

It is too bad that we have lost our enthusiasm for our democracy. We have taken it for granted. We have taken our freedom for granted. We must regain our enthusiasm for it. As Mr. Adlai Stevenson said in a speech the other day, "We have a success story to tell." Instead of telling it to the world we have cut our appropriations for the very instrumentalities that could tell our success story to the world.

As he said, we have gone through a social revolution, and yet we have lost none of our freedom and in the process have made Socialism obsolete. We ought to tell that story to the world. We ought to appropriate the money that is necessary to tell that story to the world. We ought to recapture something of the enthusiasm for our way of life. Only in that way can we win this battle in the realm of ideas. Only in that way can we defeat communism. Communism is based on a false ideal while our democracy is built upon moral and spiritual foundations. We must in some way convince those peoples whom we want to win to our side, that our way of life promises them freedom as well as social and industrial progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, at various times I suppose that most of us have experienced feelings approaching frustration as we have contemplated present international tensions. As we reflect on the billions of dollars which this Government has expended in a serious endeavor to promote world peace and security we find ourselves asking these questions: "Has it been worthwhile? Has anything constructive been accomplished? Will it not be pure folly to continue our efforts in this direction?"

And yet if we do not allow ourselves to be blinded by a sense of futility because we have not achieved our objectives I think we shall find that our actions have been far from in vain. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and others have stressed the advantages which have accrued to this Nation and to the free world generally as a result of our cooperation with nations whose principles and ideals are basically similar to ours.

Suffice it to say that notwithstanding the waste and extravagance and the questionable value of some of the programs inaugurated in great haste and under the stress of the times the free world still exists and is much stronger than would be the case were it not for our active participation against the forces who seek to destroy it. And let us not forget that this has contributed to our own strength as well as to that of others, for if the rest of the world were

under Communist domination the position of the United States would be almost hopeless.

Therefore, we should rid ourselves of the illusion that the funds appropriated for the mutual-security program constitute charity. This contributes to the security of the United States almost as much as it does to that of the other nations involved. We need their help and they need ours in the struggle against the most ruthless and powerful revolutionary force in history.

President Eisenhower recognizes this. Only last week he sent a special message to the Congress emphasizing the importance of the mutual-security program and urging the passage of this bill. As a great military figure he is fully cognizant of the problems involved in the titanic struggle now going on. He understands very clearly that without collective security among the freedom-loving nations there can be no individual security in the modern world. I believe that under his wise and competent leadership our security and freedom can be maintained.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have before us the latest edition of a series of acts, all bearing sugar-coated titles, by which billions of dollars have been ladeled out in the far corners of the earth with little or nothing in return.

This measure, like some of its predecessors, is euphoniously labeled a Mutual Security Act. Like its predecessors, it will provide neither mutuality nor security. Of two things we can be certain—it will provide an increase in the Federal debt, and if ever paid it will mean an increase in taxes.

As fictitious and illusionary as are these two words "mutual security" when applied to about 98 percent of the foreign nations with which we are dealing, and as devastating as is this continued dissipation of our natural resources and finances, there is a still greater, fundamental evil in this bill.

There is scarcely a paragraph which does not in some manner delegate arbitrary power to the President. I challenge anyone to deny the statement I am about to make; that except in an all-out war, no single piece of legislation of such worldwide ramifications and involving such an amount of money has ever given a President more sweeping powers. The delegated powers in this bill are so vast and unprecedented that no President should be given them, no President should seek them, and any President should refuse them.

This bill is based on a false premise. Section 101, the first section and first sentence, states:

The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations.

Every Member of this Congress knows that is monstrous and affronting language. If it be the policy of the United States to achieve peace and security through the United Nations, then why the Geneva Conference, NATO, EDC, the

proposal for a defense pact in southeast Asia, and other alliances and agreements, all of which bypass and ignore the United Nations? The truth is that the United Nations is a snare and a delusion. Korea, and now Indochina, have clearly demonstrated that as a world organization the United Nations is utterly useless for stopping war or waging war against armed aggression.

The end of the shooting war in Korea and the return of Washingtonitis—the social whirl, lavish dinners, foreign embassy lawn parties, and other similar activities too numerous to mention—may have dimmed the memories of some, but to others there is the acute memory of 35,000 American dead in Korea; the stark and naked fact that Americans did more than 90 percent of the fighting and dying and all of the financing of that disastrous attempt to halt Communist aggression while 44 member nations of the United Nations, representing a total population of more than a billion persons, contributed not a single combat soldier.

And now Secretary of State Dulles has blandly predicted he can obtain the endorsement and moral support of the United Nations for military intervention in Indochina. Did the United States go into the United Nations for moral support or in the belief that all member nations were united and determined to halt aggression such as that in Korea?

Let me say here and now that there will be more than a moral commitment on the part of other nations before I vote to send the youth of America to die in southeast Asia while the British and other so-called free-world friends and our own munition tycoons, casket makers, and others stuff their pockets with profits.

I reiterate that on the established record of dismal failure it is the worst kind of hypocrisy to assert in the opening sentence of this bill that it is the policy of the United States to obtain international peace and security through the United Nations. Let us be decent enough to strike that language and spare the American people such sham and fraud.

Nearly a billion and a half dollars of the total contained in this measure would be allocated to military assistance and be spent wherever the President sees fit. Despite the huge amounts already expended for this purpose, there is still no evidence that some of the chief beneficiaries, notably France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, would be even fair-weather allies. Even the British give no evidence that they will cross the Rubicon of war unless the British Isles or some segment of their empire is attacked. And to those of you who have unemployed industrial workers, I suggest you ascertain, if you can, how many hundreds of millions in this multi-billion-dollar bill can be expended for the products of foreign labor in foreign factories.

Still with us in this 1954 version of the great international giveaway of the American taxpayer's pants—the shirt has long since gone—is that good old global boondoggle which the New Dealers fondly called point 4, but which the Republicans have austere labeled in the bill as "technical cooperation." The

price tag on this item, as near as I can determine, is around \$112 million.

Do you know how point 4 originated? Let me give you a little history. Back in January 1949 a now-retired President by the name of Truman delivered his inaugural address. In that address he discussed an alleged foreign policy predicated then, as now, on the sweet-scented dream that money will buy friendship and bribed friends will somehow influence enemies to become paragons of virtue.

Anyway, the Truman foreign policy as of January 1949 set forth four objectives: First, strengthen the United Nations; second, world economic recovery; third, halt aggression; and, fourth, "a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

Since there could be little hope of attaining the first three objectives, it was only natural that emphasis would be placed on point 4. Why not something bold and new for the underdeveloped areas of the world? After all, making two blades of grass grow in the Sahara where only one grew before or teaching Italian peasants how to shuck corn by hand—which they have been doing for a couple of centuries—would give American taxpayers another opportunity to get rid of some of their surplus cash. And teaching 8-cent-an-hour Japanese workers how to knit woolen gloves and mittens gave American workers in our own knitting mills an opportunity to take a rest from picking up their paychecks. Yes, by all means develop the underdeveloped and train others the same art. And so we did.

It is noteworthy that during the fiscal years 1951-53 there were 2,769 trainees as compared with a United States training staff of 2,405. In other words, there were only 364 more trainees than there were trainers. Never did so few Indians have so many chiefs, but that seems to be the trademark of the great foreign boondoggle with which we are now dealing.

And something new is proposed to be added to point 4 under this legislation. It is an International Development Advisory Board, composed of 13 members appointed by the President, whose stated duty it will be to give advice as to policy. Following the usual pattern of such appointments, it is probable the board's first undertaking would be a junket to the far corners of the earth and in the end each member would undoubtedly become a huckster for bigger and better appropriations for point 4. If memory serves me correctly, one of the Republican pledges of the 1952 campaign was fewer boards, bureaus, and commissions in the Federal Government. But that was nearly 2 years ago.

Under the heading of "Other programs," page 34 of the bill, we find \$150 million earmarked apparently for the support of mercenary troops. For the first time in the history of this country, despite our experience with the Hessians that Britain threw at our forefathers as they fought and died to win our independence, we are being called upon under title 4 of this bill to underwrite the

existence and expense of European non-descripts, organized in the hoary ranks of some kind of a mercenary military force. I suggest that Members of the House insist on far more detail concerning this move than is contained in section 401 of the bill.

Section 414 is entitled "Encouragement of Free Enterprise and Private Participation," and then follows a beautiful job of window-dressing leading up to authority for the President to guarantee investments in foreign countries against expropriation or confiscation to a total of \$200 million. Last year I called the attention of this House to the fact that the United Nations had taken official action providing that the government of any member nation could at any time seize private property for use of the state. The United States representative voted against this action but it was approved anyway. Now we have the strange and sorry spectacle of legislation to provide use of American taxpayer's money to indemnify an American investor in a foreign country whose investment may have been grabbed for the purpose of furthering state socialism. And this is the same United Nations to which, if you vote for this bill, you pay homage in the first sentence of the first section.

Mr. Chairman, this is new deal, fair deal, raw deal legislation at its worst.

Other provisions range from giving the President authority in connection with this act to suspend all laws dealing with contracts; to spend billions of dollars as he may elect; to assign any employee in the executive branch of government to international organizations, to becoming the director of a glorified international travel bureau.

Mr. Chairman, this is unwarranted and dangerous legislation. The American people are already dangerously over-committed, militarily and financially, throughout the world.

Sixty billion dollars have been expended since World War II on the enterprises here contemplated. Individuals, States, municipalities, and counties have been drained of their tax revenues to help support these programs which have produced nothing but abysmal failure. I refuse to be a party to national bankruptcy and destruction of this form of government and I am unalterably opposed to this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the minority report. It makes good sense. And I must express agreement with the remarks of Mr. BROWN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BENTLEY, Mrs. CHURCH, and the others opposing this bill. Little more can be said—they have admirably summed up the case. I venture these remarks just so my position can be made clear.

I want peace. I want cooperation. I want friends. I want to defeat the Communist conspiracy. I just do not believe the continued bleeding of the American taxpayer will do what we wish. If I thought otherwise I would vote for the bill. But the self-evident bankruptcy of the idea that we can buy peace is enough for me.

For a great many years—ever since the Marshall plan was inaugurated, I have been listening to the debate and reading the articles, and I feel much today as though I had gone to the movies and stayed too long; this is where I came in. I am reminded of another analogy. You have heard the story of the old gentleman who stayed through the movie about 10 or 12 times and when asked why he did that he said, "I kept on staying there because I thought, maybe sometime it would come out different." We have been spending our billions for, lo, these many years, each time hoping that it will come out different.

We have been spending these billions hopefully, saying to ourselves, "Well now, this time this appropriation will do it." And today we find all of our hopes for peace, all of our hopes for a free world in a shambles at our feet. We are worse off today by far than we were when we started with the Marshall plan which, if you will recall, was advanced for the sole purpose, so we were told, to put starving people back on their feet in the aftermath of a horrible war. Then later it became the excuse that we were advancing these moneys to stop communism. Yet, in the years that have elapsed, we find over four times as many people behind the Iron Curtain as there were when we started the expenditure of these billions.

Yesterday as I sat watching my television set I saw Secretary Humphrey explaining things to us about the Nation's economic situation in a hopeful vein. But I also heard him tell us that he guessed they were going to ask us to raise the debt limit once more. So if we give this \$3.5 billion in addition to the nearly \$10 billion already unallocated or unspent we are going to be confronted with the necessity of borrowing more money in order to give it to nations which, if the London Economist is correct, today have greater gold reserves in their treasury than they have had for many, many years. We are going to give it to countries like France, where in Paris last year I heard the man who is administering this program say that it was worked on this basis: They found out how much France thought she could raise, how much France wanted to spend, and we put into the kitty the difference. That is the way the program has been and will be administered as long as we are crazy enough to fall for the idea that our billions will accomplish the desired end that we all agree upon.

It seems to me the basic question behind all of this that we have not been coming to grips with, or not quite so much as we should, is, Will this kind of program really save us from communism? I know no other test, at least none so good, as that of experience. If experience tells us anything, surely it must tell us that we have no friends on the earth today that can be counted on in the pinch.

Let us be practical. France, today, because of the tremendous Communist part of her population, is paralyzed. I do not think anyone can quarrel with that. Germany is divided because of the foolish mistakes that we made during and after the war, and cannot be count-

ed on at the moment. England is scared to death, and perhaps with reason. But that is no reason why we should not face up to the facts.

It seems to me we are making mistakes because there are four basic fallacies behind the whole program. Of course we want to preserve peace. Of course we want allies. Of course we want help. We want strength. But we are going on the assumption that our own safety is inevitably and always endangered with every outbreak anywhere on the face of the globe. That I categorically reject, even though it may be true in part in some instances, but the facts do not justify that broad generalization.

The second is, assuming the first is correct, that our money will save the situation in spite of all of the concrete evidence which proves exactly the contrary.

And third, that the 160 millions of us can support the billions of people on the face of this teaming world indefinitely. Lastly, that the friends we have today will necessarily continue to be our friends tomorrow.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said he had heard no one answer the question "What would you do?" Well, I will give him one answer. I would keep our powder dry. I would make ourselves superlatively strong. I would not waste our money upon those nations that have evinced no will to either fight communism or to even try to resist its inroads. That is the answer I gave long before I came to these halls, and it is the only sane answer I can see because surely experience has demonstrated beyond all question that we are not isolationists, but we are isolated today—isolated because the minds of men around the face of the globe have not yet realized the nature of the threat.

We have in our midst today as visitors those who would appease and those who did appease, and if we are not careful, we will be led into the same trap. I think we have gone beyond our capacity. I shall vote against raising the debt limit because if we refuse this money, there will be no need to raise the debt limit. I refuse to believe that the way to avoid bankruptcy is to keep on borrowing money when I know that over \$18 billion have been spent since the inception of these programs for the payment of nothing but interest. And when I see ourselves without a friend on the face of the globe who would lift their hands effectively to help us in the show-down fight that eventually will come—when I see all that, I shall refuse to vote one additional cent.

I intended to ask the rhetorical question: When will it end? It has been answered. We have been told we will go on indefinitely. Some day the American taxpayer will rise up in rebellion. I am sure they are in my district. They are unwilling to contribute further to the treasuries of those nations that are unwilling to do that which they should do, if they are at all alarmed at the Communist threat. These nations are unwilling to do what they should because they are Socialist in concept, and be-

cause they wish to spend their money for things which will keep their administrations in power. And we, of course, are not without guilt in that regard.

We are looking abroad with Guatemala under our noses, praying that by continuing a program that has fallen flat on its face over the years, some unlooked-for miracle will occur between now and tomorrow morning and the money that we take from the pockets of the American taxpayers will somehow or other save us. I hope we will not continue to confuse the worthy objectives behind all these ideas with our capacity or our means to accomplish them. I hope we will not confuse worthy objectives with the mistaken thought that the appropriations we are asked to make will achieve those ends.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I have the highest respect for each and every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I do not think there is a committee in this Congress that has a more difficult task confronting them than that committee has had ever since I have been a member during the past 12 years. I wish with all my heart that I could go along with them on this bill because they deserve the respect and the support of the Members of Congress. However, I could not square my conscience by doing so. So am I concerned about the support that this committee ought to have as opposed to my own views that I feel I should clarify for the record so that my constituents will know where I stand and why I voted as I did.

In the first place, we are engaged in a collective security struggle throughout the world. Everything that has been done regarding our foreign policy supposedly has been done with the idea of a collective-security program. But this new \$2 billion in new and carryover appropriations for the war in Indochina is not in keeping with that policy because this \$2 billion provides for a go-it-alone policy in Indochina. Make no mistake about it. It is not a United Nations action, we have no allies except a half ally in France. And here is the peculiar position in which we find ourselves. The present Premier of France has been elected by a very small margin on the promise to the French people that if he does not end the war in Indochina in 30 days he is going to resign. Yet in this bill we are appropriating \$2 billion to carry the war on in Indochina for 2 years at the cost it has been going on for the past year. In other words, we may find ourselves in the position where in less than 20 days, because already 10 days have expired, France may completely fold up and pull out. But here we have appropriated \$2 billion to continue a war in which nobody will be involved except the United States of America. So we are going it alone.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will look on page 13, he will find that that money

is appropriated for southeast Asia and the western Pacific, which is a much bigger area than Indochina. The whole program is to save southeast Asia.

Mr. O'KONSKI. But the bulk of it is going to carry on the Indochina war.

Mr. JUDD. If Indochina went down, the necessity for saving the surrounding areas would be greater, not less.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I cannot conceive of carrying on a policy of war for a country which itself is not sold on war.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I assure the gentleman that no such undertaking as that will be a part of the policy of this Government.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am glad to have the assurance of our majority leader because I know his words are quite weighty on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, we are making a great mistake. We are saying in reality that all we have to do is to arm this country and arm that country and have a strong Army and a strong Navy and the world is going to come out all right. In other words, it seems to me we are basing too much of our entire philosophy and thesis upon strength and strength alone. I discount that thesis entirely. I think one ounce of righteousness is worth 100 divisions in any war, and we find ourselves, particularly in the case of Indochina, where we are not on the side of right, and we will never win. With all the billions of dollars that we have already poured into Indochina, in many cases and in many of the individual battles the armed strength on the so-called French side has outnumbered the other side by a ratio of 20 to 1, and they could not win because right was not on their side. Unfortunately, the people of Indochina have been sold on the idea that the Communists are on their side, that they will obtain their independence, and that the Americans are trying to foist French colonialism and exploitation upon them. We can pour \$100 billion into Indochina and send 6 million American boys into Indochina, which I am positive we will not do, but it will not solve anything, because we are on the wrong side of the fence, and as long as we are on the wrong side, it does not pay to continue to operate a war under those conditions.

Now, I have never been in Asia, but from 1931 to 1934 I taught about 100 Asiatic students on the west coast. They came from Malaya, they came from India, they came from Japan, from Indochina, and Indonesia, and I learned a lot from those people who we do not understand. The most important thing I know of in Asia is saving face. That country that loses face with the Asians loses face for all time, and I would much rather have a situation develop where, in my honest consciousness, instead of spending this vast amount of money, we would pass a resolution in this Congress something to this effect, that our hearts and sympathies are with the Indochinese people and we hope and pray for their independence and we will do everything possible to obtain their independence from French colonialism

and the Communists, and if we pass that simple resolution and just leave this appropriation out, it would do more to save our face throughout Asia and throughout the world than anything you might possibly do. Because this is the description given me by these Asiatic students I taught years ago. They said the Asiatics might be compared to two dogs. One dog is a very rich dog. He has a \$500 house in which he lives, made by his master; he has a beautiful silk pillow upon which he sleeps at night. But, this dog that has that \$500 house and that silk pillow to sleep on and the best of food is not happy because he is chained. On the other hand, you take a dog that is free to roam the woods. He is never clean, he never has a bath, he has no house to live in, nothing to sleep on, and he gets his food from the garbage can, but that dog is not chained and that dog is happy. And, these students told me at that time, when this thing was in the making, that that was the philosophy of these Asiatic people. They do not care what master serves them, they do not care what kind of house they have, they do not even care anything about the economic conditions, but they want their freedom; they want to be free.

Now, we are promising them all sorts of things. We are promising them ammunition, we are promising them guns and foods. They do not want that. What they want to be promised is their freedom and their independence. We cannot save face in Asia by upholding French colonialism and slavery. Yet this appropriation does just that. We are inviting \$2 billion of ill-will in Asia by the passage of this bill. Its purpose is contrary to everything America should stand for. I cannot reconcile helping to fight for French colonialism and bigotry with what I know all Asians and Americans really want.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the rush to fill our immigration quotas was slowing down or if the people in Europe and Asia and South America and Africa and Australia showed no further inclination to settle in the United States, then I should think we would be in bad shape indeed. The fact remains that people still want to come to the United States.

There is something about the United States that people from other lands have preferred. Perhaps it is opportunity, the opportunity to develop to the fullest, the talents with which the Creator has endowed us; to stifle a talent, to us, is a crime. As a nation of coaches, we delight in fielding great teams, every member being taught to stand on his own feet, to use his own head, even in the most synchronized of plays.

Until we make known to others that to stifle a talent and not to use it for the good of the individual and his fellowman is wicked and wasteful, then moneys used to promote this program will avail little. The bayonet must not stick out beyond the covenant. The things the bayonet must be on guard to

protect, it seems to me, are what people stand for, the conditions they seek to overcome in their desire to build a better life for themselves and for others, a life in which pain and suffering, physical and mental, are reduced to the minimum known to man. Launched on that premise, this bill can help alleviate suffering and promote a sense of security sufficient to allow men and women on the five continents of this planet to work out better destinies for each other.

This, then, is our workshop, Mr. Chairman—5 continents, 2½ billion people, half of whom earn less than 9 percent of the world's total income. In biology, inbreeding waters the blood, produces degenerates. In economics, can the United States long trade with itself? What if the rest of the world could realize for itself the opportunities the United States holds out for its people? Energy vitalizes. This bill, properly administered, can vitalize others and, in turn, ourselves.

Much has been said of money's Uncle Sam has poured out since World War II to promote and to lift the level of living of others in Europe and Asia. Little, if anything, has been said of the increase in the gross national product of the United States as a result of so doing.

During World War II, our dollar shrank to practically zero—we gave stuff away, lend-leased it to survive and win. Our product grew.

Some have said that if man could find the moral equivalent of war in peace, the millennium would arrive. This bill makes a step in that direction. It seeks to make all think of each other's benefit, as happens in war.

Strategically, tactically, economically, politically, and socially, this bill can spell out benefits for the United States and for every nation on the five continents interested in the fullest development of man under freedom.

I regret that some think England is closer to Russia and thus more vulnerable to atomic attack than is the United States. Do they overlook Alaska? In the Bering Sea, a very small distance separates a Russian classroom from an American classroom.

From 10 Downing Street, England appears safer than ever. It is the United States that is in greater danger of being mousetrapped. The British axle pierces the globe. Canada is above us. The British are in offshore Europe, and the Australians sit in the Pacific with the contending forces of the world in seeming stalemate above them. Canada has a right bower in the United States. The British have a buffer in Western Europe, and Australia is safe so long as the contending forces keep swirling above it.

The Soviets? The danger they face is being mousetrapped into a local war in the Pacific with the United States. This would play the game of the neutralists who desire to see the two giants bleed and wear each other out farthest from Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Mainland China? Now that Japan is, for all practical purposes, surrounded on three sides, in the north, by the Soviets in the Sakhalins, by the Chinese Reds in Korea, and on mainland China; the

southern flank of Japan opens to Formosa. To the Chinese Reds, Japan thus, is no threat.

Does the workshop spell out other factors, Mr. Speaker? Would stalemate be one? A system of checks and balances on the big board among the powers of the world?

One could power play, I suppose, all kinds of combinations and permutations in the quest of organized man for security in the modern world.

And before closing with an observation about British candor, I think one can approach a reasonable vote on this bill, Mr. Chairman, if one's definition of international relations is sound, and if the bill seeks to answer a question raised by that definition.

Offered as a possible workable definition of international relations is the following: It is what you as a people have, and how you are going to get what you need to live as a people. If you can't get what you need to live by negotiation, then you must fight or perish.

The question is, does this bill seek to give nations more ability to attain by negotiation what they need to live? And if unable to obtain what they need to live in self-respect by negotiation will they then be ready to fight, lest they perish? If the bill does this, then it is a good bill and should pass.

And now, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey, which it is my honor here to represent, I should like to pass along an observation to our friends, the brave and candid British: It deals with procedure to be taken when Uncle Sam and John Bull are not in focus with each other, as they obviously were not in World War II objectives in the Orient. The question is, how best to handle such a situation with the American people?

For example, during World War II, a brilliant series of documentary films was put out, called *Why We Fight*. It was shown to troops in the allied effort. It is my understanding that two scripts were presented by Americans on the China story. The British declined to approve either script. No film on China was made. One could conclude that while Uncle Sam fought for the people of China to be free of foreign oppression, the British were chiefly interested in the profit picture of the Commonwealth in Asia.

Is it for the people of the United States to understand more fully that, in foreign affairs, in peace or war, Americans will be continually disillusioned and hurt unless they realize that with the British, two questions must be answered in the affirmative: One, will it work, and two, is it profitable?

If the above is so, and if Americans had understood British politics more completely, and took commonwealth tactics more into consideration, then perhaps half or more of the blame American leveled against American for the loss of mainland China to the Reds might never have been leveled.

On the above basis would it be fair to ask the British whether, in matters of trade, the Soviets could eventually, if not now, become British brokers in the Orient, especially for Red China? In 1952,

a check deposited in Hong Kong by a United States Coast Guard officer, cleared through a bank in Moscow.

I trust that this bill will do everything possible, Mr. Chairman, to keep Americans abreast of foreign affairs on each of the five continents, with as little pain and suffering to the people thereon as possible.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, with the exception of 15 minutes, to be used tomorrow.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and I had an agreement with reference to the time that we would each reserve 15 minutes for use tomorrow by the Speaker and the minority leader.

Other than that, I have no further requests for time, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9678), to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made today and include extraneous matter, and I make the same request for my colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] and for other Members who have spoken on the bill today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9474) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: After line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article the continued domestic production of which, in volume sufficient to meet projected national defense requirements, as determined by the President, would be threatened by such decrease in duty."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the House concur in Senate amendment numbered 1 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the first Senate amendment would require the President to make a determination of whether a decrease in duty on any article would threaten continued domestic production in volume sufficient to meet projected national-defense requirements.

While there can be no question about the desirability of the objective of the Senate amendment, it needs clarification and improvement. For example, the Senate amendment would not necessarily prohibit a decrease in duty with respect to a given article even though the decrease threatened the particular industry concerned and even though that industry were vital to projected defense requirements. In many cases, as we know, it is not the particular article which is important to defense but the industry which is dependent for its existence upon that article. The amendment which I have sent to the desk clarifies that situation and also insures that the President can exercise discretion in applying the provision.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that the purpose of this modified form of the amendment here presented is to make certain that discretionary authority is vested in the President of the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second Senate amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: After line 7, insert:

"Sec. 3. The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, the second Senate amendment simply provides that enactment of this act shall not be construed to indicate approval or disapproval by the Congress of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly referred to as GATT. A similar provision has been included in the last two extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Act and for this reason I believe there can be no objection to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

C—573

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motions was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8680) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 6 and 58 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution authorizing the clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H. R. 8680.

THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, whatever beneficial results there may be from the talks now going on at the White House, this possible good could be completely nullified unless something is done to save the coal industry from utter destruction.

Again it is my duty, not only as the Representative of the second largest coal-producing congressional district in the United States, but also as a Representative well aware of the very serious international situation forced upon us today by unfriendly foreign powers, to call the attention of the Congress, and the administration, to an extremely critical situation.

Here the House of Representatives is asked, again today, to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another year. We still have been denied an opportunity to present the grave situation—and it is grave—now existing in the coal industry of our country. In addition, we are not even permitted the right to attempt to restrict the constantly increasing importation of cheap foreign residual oil.

It is, or should be, a well known fact that we are unable to expand our industrial production to any appreciable degree without a healthy coal industry. In the unhappy and unfortunate event our country should be forced into war by a foreign nation, how in the world could this country return to full industrial production, which would be so vital, with one of our major and indispensable in-

dustries in such grave condition as it is today.

During the last 18 months we have seen hundreds of coal mines shut down. The machinery has for the most part been removed from these mines. As for further coal production, these mines will be lost without extensive and expensive pumping as well as other restorative activities that would require months, and possibly years. The necessary equipment of the railroads now idle—the same equipment that formerly carried our production of coal—is now badly deteriorated, a good portion of it already past possible further use.

The unemployment and resultant human misery is now at an all-time high in the coal areas of the United States.

If we are to be prudent in our efforts to safeguard the basic security of our country, our own self-preservation, then the Congress of the United States must, now, face up to its responsibility and pass legislation to protect in a fair and just manner our own basic coal industry from the unfair competition occasioned by the unchecked and constantly increasing importation of cheap foreign residual fuel oil.

In considering our full responsibility to the American people, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully bring to the attention of the membership of this Congress, and to the administration, that now is the time to act. Next year may be too late.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time this week to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) to express the sense of Congress on interference in the Western Hemisphere by the Soviet Communists, under the general rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object because I am very much in favor of this resolution; however, I do want to take a moment to express my pride in the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I congratulate him for his wisdom in taking this very necessary and important step in reaffirming the ancient policy of the United States of America with reference to the encroachment of any country in the Western Hemisphere. I think not only Texas should be proud of him, but the entire country should be proud of him.

I take a particular sense of pleasure in urging adoption of this resolution.

That feeling flows from the fact that this is a move to unite, rather than to divide, our people.

There is no partisanship in this resolution, other than the partisanship of defending American freedoms against Communist dictatorship. That is the sole issue embodied in this declaration.

This resolution is a modern restatement of a policy that has guided our people for 130 years. It is a notice to the world that the Monroe Doctrine can be, and will be, adapted to the changing

conditions imposed upon us by aggressive Communist imperialism.

I have a great feeling of pride in the reaction of Congress to this resolution.

It was proposed by the Senate minority, and approved immediately by the majority.

It received the favorable and unanimous vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was adopted by the Senate itself by an overwhelming vote. It has the approval of the State Department.

I hope, and expect, it will have the same overwhelming approval of this House. It will then truly become the voice of a united America.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for America to speak with a united voice in the world of today. There is an equally urgent need for public recognition of the new situation which we face.

First, we must recognize that Communist imperialism precedes military conquest with infiltration, sabotage, and subversion.

Second, we must recognize that Communist efforts to penetrate the Western Hemisphere must be met by the united efforts of all nations of the Western Hemisphere.

This resolution recognizes those basic fundamentals. It provides the basis for a policy which can bring unity both within our Nation and within the Western Hemisphere—a unity which will keep all of us free.

I am convinced now, as I have always been, that freedom will survive providing we unite ourselves against the enemy. This resolution, as a legislative expression of foreign policy, is a long step toward that unity.

I urge its speedy and unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Texas has said. I might say in addition that the news from Guatemala this morning was certainly welcome to all of us. It is evidence of the fine handling, starting some months ago, at the Caracas Conference of a situation which certainly was foreboding to us. I am sure we are all happy at the developments there. I might also say it is our purpose to call up this resolution the first thing in the morning upon the meeting of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was on objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE JOB WE MUST DO FOR OUR PEOPLE

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, to represent the people of my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, is a distinct honor to me. To serve with the membership of this House of Congress is a privilege to which I have long looked forward. The opportunity to serve my people is my desire and my pleasure.

Having spent some 18 years in State government prior to my election to Congress, the problems and procedures of government were not entirely new to me when I took my seat in this House of Representatives. What I was to learn, however, was the greatness of our American system of representation in Government. I soon learned that in the presence of the great men in this House one could still sense the spirit of the people back home. The strength of our Nation depends entirely upon proper representation by us of the ideals and hopes and character of those who placed that great trust in us.

When I speak of our work in Washington I cannot but do so with a swell of pride within me. Whatever part I have played in the developments and accomplishments of the 83d Congress have been a result of sincere effort and conscientious study of what is good for the people of my district and the people of America.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to the membership of this House for its generous assistance on the problems which have been mine, and especially do I want to thank the Louisiana delegation for the many times they have responded unselfishly with both time and effort in behalf of the people I represent. The theory of a system of laws and not of men certainly was made a reality by the tireless and enlightened actions of patriots such as those with whom I serve.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that I may serve long in this House. My only ambition is to serve creditably and well. The words of Daniel Webster inscribed above the Speaker's desk have always been an inspiration to me. The words, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered," have such great meaning that one who follows them could not help but serve with inspiration.

The people of my district are a strong people. They bear their burdens of taxation and assume their full share of

responsibility for our Nation's welfare. They in turn expect our National Government to assume responsibilities which rightfully are encompassed in its designated scope.

In my service to them, I state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to survive as a Nation of freemen, we must not fail to observe the responsibilities and rights of the sovereign States. We must allow the National Government to be representative of the collective will of those States and not reverse this original concept.

In these trying times, it is perhaps easy to revert to a practice of spending ourselves out of our world problems. My people, Mr. Speaker, are a wise people. In representing them and my own conscience and judgment, I must reiterate that we must not spend ourselves into bankruptcy in attempting to save other nations from the same fate. I never knew a doctor to cure a patient by getting into bed with him.

We must exercise certain economies, but let us effect these savings first in the direction of doles to foreign countries. I believe that nations, like people, can best be helped in a manner that will not rob them of their self-respect and sense of responsibility. We must, if we are to remain strong, look to the solving of the many of our own problems which have been, perhaps, unnecessarily postponed because of international responsibilities.

The value of the inland ports of Louisiana has been proved in both national security and economy. The inland waterways in Louisiana played a large part in the safe transportation of supplies during the Second World War. We have thus far done a marvelous job in the development of these facilities and in many instances, the people of my district have borne the costs. We must turn to these problems, Mr. Speaker, as the development of waterways there means the development of strength nationally.

This is also true in matters of flood control. A plea for our people in the matter of more assistance for flood control to alleviate a danger not caused solely by local conditions is not a selfish plea. The waters that flow down through Louisiana to the sea are poured upon us by some 30 rivers extending from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The problem is a national one and it is my hope that my pleas will not go unheeded.

The farmers of the Seventh District of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, are among the most enlightened farmers in the world. They responded to our call for previously unheard-of production during times of national emergency and, while we are now faced with a problem of farm surpluses, this is not a problem existing solely as the farmers' responsibility.

When war plants were asked to produce more and more machines of war, the Federal Government assumed, and properly so, responsibility for unneeded production at the war's end. Why not treat the farmers in similar fashion? I shall continue, Mr. Speaker, to interest myself in this problem. With proper planning, our farmers can prosper, but most important, the small farmers must be protected.

According to qualified reports and forecasts, we in the United States will be pressed to furnish sufficient quantities of food and fiber for our own use. Farm surpluses, therefore, are a temporary problem and should be considered as such.

The cutting of price supports in the absence of a better farm program, and I have seen none suggested, will result in thousands of our small farmers being forced off the farms. Where will they go? If the farm economy fails, other segments of our economy will surely follow. The results of this in unemployment of not only industrial workers, but also those who, after having left the farms, will necessarily go to the cities to seek a means of livelihood. The National Government will surely then have a problem of great proportions, much greater than the cost of the present farm program.

Rather than curtail our farm production, Mr. Speaker, the Government, I believe, should stress farm research and training in order that the ability to produce in sufficient quantities for the future is preserved.

Our departments of the National Government should also strive toward development of more and better markets for our products. Too many times in the past our own markets have been overlooked and our governmental departments have actually participated in arranging sales and deliveries to other governments from foreign competitors in the face of a stated desire for our products.

Southwest Louisiana is experiencing great progress. This is partly due to the favorable location we enjoy as to climate, fresh water for industrial use and navigation, an abundance of cheap fuel, a pleasant climate, but most of all because our people, both workers and businessmen, have forever strived to make every venture a success. With these great advantages, Mr. Speaker, we cannot help but prosper and we invite others to come in and enjoy these advantages and help us develop our resources. As I have stated before, where our areas are developed and strengthened, so is our Nation strengthened. I, therefore, will continue my fight to develop a policy of helpfulness from Washington. We need a helping hand from the Federal Government in the development of industries. New industries, at present-day construction costs, cannot compete with older and established plants. We need a liberalization of policy in the issuance of certificates of necessity for tax purposes. This is the type of help a government can give its people. Far from being a handout or grant, it will insure a great income to the people and to the Treasury in later years which otherwise will not exist.

I wish to thank the Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, for assisting me in a time of peril and great need of our people. During the great flood of 1953, we did succeed in getting help to the stricken areas in time. When our cotton farmers suffered from inadvertent action of the Corps of Engineers, a sympathetic group of Members and a co-operative group of administrators saw to

it that they were reimbursed. I thank the members of the Public Works Committee for the approval of a badly needed flood-control project which has already begun to be surveyed.

I am grateful that we were able, through the assistance of the other body, to place the responsibility of operation and maintenance of navigation and water control facilities where they properly belong. I am indeed happy that a plan for building of much needed post offices and Federal court buildings for which I introduced legislation has finally been passed. I am hopeful that my legislation providing for assistance to small towns for construction of sewage, water, and gas facilities will soon be passed. This will not be a handout, but a helping hand of a government to its people.

A measure of justice was meted out by our body, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of our tidelands. Our people were successful at least, in part, in regaining that which was ours. This problem was resolved in true democratic fashion and after being fully debated, was resolved in good spirit.

Our sweetpotato industry was perhaps saved last year and this by the continuation of the Federal pest-control program which coordinates the program between the various States. While Louisiana spends more on this program than all other producing States put together, we still feel that the coordination effected by Federal agents is necessary. I shall exert every effort toward its continuance.

I have stated my position and the position of my people from time to time in this House and in committees and I again say I will fight waste in government at every turn. I will lend my hand to the battle against that vicious threat that is communism, both at home and abroad. Those in our country should be sought out and destroyed; those abroad should be forever watched and not given any quarter, else they will surely spread their false doctrine and enslave more and more of the freedom-loving people of the world.

One way to keep America strong, Mr. Speaker, is to keep our communities strong. The post office has become an institution in our smaller communities and I hope it may be decided not to discontinue these small post offices. The discontinuance of these offices will take away from the people in the areas involved accommodations to which they are entitled as a service of our Federal Government, but more important, I think, it will take away from these small communities their common meeting place which is important to them for exchange of ideas, the dissemination of news, and the development of community interests. I feel that one great reason our people have been able to react so quickly at times of national emergency is that they, even in the smallest communities, meet almost daily at their post office, and are thus able to keep fully informed on current happenings. It is not at all difficult to visualize that these communities, after the post office is closed, will very shortly lose their identity and the residents of the countryside

will lose contact with their neighbors. I agree that economies in government are to be desired and I assure you of my fullest cooperation in any matter where economies can be effected; however, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the value of the small post office to a community by far outweighs the small economies that will be realized by their closing. I sincerely hope that this important service to which our people have become accustomed and to which they are entitled can be continued.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of this House, there is much to be done. We must save the economy and the strength and the spirit of our own people and country. We must stop the everpressing threat of world communism. But we cannot spend our way out of this trouble. We cannot buy lasting friendship. Let us devote our attention to the needs of our people; let us show our appreciation to those who have proved their love of democratic ideals; let us not turn a deaf ear to the needs of our veterans and their families; let us protect our workingmen and our small farmers and fishermen and small-business men. When we do this we vitalize the spirit and strength of our Nation. When the eyes of the world see the contentment of the individual, the happiness of the family unit, the strength of a free people under God will be displayed to many in much more convincing fashion than a display of ability to spend dollars or drop bombs. Military strength is a necessity for defense of ourselves or others who would be free. But primarily let us live the Christian life; let us make known to others what is to be had from our way of life by a display of strength of purpose and character; let us sell the idea of democracy. It offers most when used properly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PELLY in two instances, in one of them to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) to extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include additional matter.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3385. An act to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on interference

in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2231. An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the lower Brulé and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, to authorize a transfer of funds from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc; and

H. R. 8873. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 119. An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma; and

S. 2217. An act to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 23, 1954:

H. R. 3350. An act for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry;

H. R. 5840. An act to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange certain Hawaiian Homes Commission land and certain easements for certain privately owned land.

H. R. 7258. An act for the relief of the Willmore Engineering Co.; and

H. R. 8583. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1954:

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of Walter Carl Sander;

H. R. 724. An act for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett;

H. R. 848. An act for the relief of Nicholas Katem, Theodosia Katem, Basil Katem, and Josephine Katem;

H. R. 1364. An act for the relief of Richard A. Kurth;

H. R. 2421. An act for the relief of Frank L. McCartha;

H. R. 2678. An act for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood;

H. R. 2848. An act to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3413. An act to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, to individual Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley;

H. R. 4030. An act to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 4919. An act for the relief of Ralph S. Pearman and others;

H. R. 5025. An act for the relief of Paul G. Kendall;

H. R. 6154. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribes;

H. R. 6196. An act for the relief of Duncan M. Chalmers, and certain other persons;

H. R. 6487. An act to approve the repayment contract negotiated with the Roza Irrigation District, Yakima project, Washington, and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8367. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8488. An act to restore eligibility of certain citizens or subjects of Germany or Japan to receive benefits under veterans' laws;

H. R. 8729. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended;

H. R. 8790. An act to authorize certain veterans' benefits for persons disabled in connection with reporting for final acceptance, induction, or entry into the active military or naval service;

H. R. 9089. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement to Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; and

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a certain tract of land to the board of education of Irwin County, Ga., and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1954:

H. R. 8779. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1954:

H. R. 2231. An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brulé and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, to authorize a transfer of funds from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior, and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc; and

H. R. 8873. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHAFER, for an indefinite period, on account of sickness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1663. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Talent Division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 450); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1664. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 12, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Carrabelle Harbor, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 451); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1665. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 21, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on San Lorenzo Creek, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 14, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 452); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1666. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 22, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, Kauai, T. H., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1667. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Governments of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1668. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of April 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1669. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1670. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Eighth Semiannual Report of the International Claims Commission of the United States from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settle-

ment Act of 1949, Public Law 445, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1671. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, approved March 10, 1950, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1672. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, approved July 3, 1948"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1673. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1674. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1676. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 24, 1954, the following resolution and bill were reported on June 25, 1954:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 400. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9678, a bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9678. A bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1925, pts. I, II, and III). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 24, 1954, the following conference report was filed on June 26, 1954:

Mr. JENSEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 9680. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1926). Ordered to be printed.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 24, 1954, the following bill was reported on June 26, 1954:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9680. A bill to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such

products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 28, 1954]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7486. A bill to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided; without amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9252. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9144. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8783. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain housing units owned by the United States to the Housing Authority of St. Louis County, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCONNELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 9640. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8549. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Breaks Interstate Park compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 236. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 165. Joint resolution to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Glendo unit, Wyoming, Missouri River Basin project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9517. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1945). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Christos Mataraggiotis, and Zoi Demetre Mataraggiotis, his wife, and Christos Mataraggiotis and Constantinos Mataraggiotis, their minor sons; with amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 803. A bill for the relief of Christakis Modinos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Enrichetta F. C. Meda-Novara; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Nouritza Terzian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Dutour Rovzar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Kathie Bartke; with amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Henning Von Royk-Lewinski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Iona Elizabeth Carrier; with amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. R. 9695. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide that certain Federal appropriations for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways be withheld from any State levying ton-mile, weight-distance, axle-mile, or other third structure highway use taxes on interstate commerce, in an amount equal to the amount which such State receives from such third structure use taxes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9696. A bill to provide that certain equipment to be installed in federally constructed or licensed hydroelectric or thermal electric power projects shall be manufactured in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 9697. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9698. A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9699. A bill to authorize the conveyance of tract No. 2 of the San Patricio gasoline storage project, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 9700. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to its application to radio and television network organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9701. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the rebroadcasting of radio and television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 9702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 9703. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 9704. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that certain employees who terminate their railroad employment shall be entitled to refund of a portion of the railroad-retirement taxes which they have paid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 9705. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act providing trustees for welfare funds for workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 9706. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Medicine Lodge Indian Peace Treaty site as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9707. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system in the case of physicians already having some coverage under such system by reason of military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 9708. A bill to provide for replacement of certain strategic metals inventories liquidated during Korean war without affecting excess-profits credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 9709. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9710. A bill to improve the civil-service system by providing for the retention and reassignment of any postmaster involuntarily separated to a position in the classified civil service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9711. A bill to authorize the construction of a tumbler dam in the Chipola River, Ala. and Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9712. A bill granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of High-

er Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 9713. A bill to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 9714. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide a uniform rate for the computation of all annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9715. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 9716. A bill to protect the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9717. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL:

H. J. Res. 551. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate annually the third week in October as National Electrical Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. Res. 601. Resolution for the relief of Elinore Libonati, sister of Elliodor M. Libonati, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 602. Resolution of inquiry to the Postmaster General regarding transmittal of hate propaganda through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 603. Resolution requesting the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate transmittal of hate propaganda through the mails; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 9718. A bill for the relief of Santos Hernandez Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 9719. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 9720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elvira Bonvini Simoncelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 9721. A bill for the relief of Dr. FredERIC S. Schlegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9722. A bill for the relief of Mihai Indig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lisa Clair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 9724. A bill for the relief of Alex Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9725. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Ciaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9726. A bill for the relief of Hassan Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 9727. A bill for the relief of John B. Sutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1055. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Ralph E. Windbigler and 100 other citizens of Elkhart, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation outlawing the Communist Party in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1056. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of AMVETS, Department of Rhode Island, relative to resolutions passed at their Ninth Annual State Convention held at Providence, R. I., on June 4-5, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1057. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Rev. Harold F. Pillsbury and others of the South Medford Baptist Church of Medford, Mass., urging passage of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1058. Also, petition of Rev. Steven M. Seminerio and others of Trinity Methodist Church of West Medford, Mass., favoring passage of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1059. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the stated clerk of the General Assembly, Cumberland Presbyterian Church Memphis, Tenn., urging Congress to take appropriate action to extend the distribution of surplus types of food and fiber above a normal carry-over and to make it possible for the voluntary agencies to distribute overseas as much of these surplus commodities as they can administer effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1060. Also, petition of the secretary, Lithuanians of Worcester, Worcester, Mass., condemning the illegal occupation by Soviet Russia through force of arms of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the commitment of atrocities, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1061. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., requesting favorable action on H. R. 9517 and H. R. 9518, relating to sewer bonds and flood-control and drainage system bonds, respectively; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1062. Also, petition of the president of city council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to inviting the President of the United States, the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Members of the Congress of the United States to participate in the ceremonial observance of Independence Day on Monday, July 5, 1954, and on each Independence Day observance thereafter in Independence Hall of the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1063. Also, petition of the president of Independent Bible Baptist Mission Board, Englewood, Colo., protesting against any relaxation of security regulations to permit any Communists, clergy or otherwise, to enter this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1064. Also, petition of the post commander, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post No. 1755, American Legion, New York, N. Y., requesting enactment of H. R. 9434, and S. 3610, providing for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1065. Also, petition of Mississippi Game and Fish Commission, Jackson, Miss., relative to setting the date for hunting ducks in Mississippi for the 55-day period preceding January 31 rather than for the 55 days preceding January 10; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1066. Also, petition of the president, Maul Chamber of Commerce, Wailuku, Maul, T. H.,

requesting repeal of Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress, relating to parcel post size and weight limits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1067. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of Mrs. Louise Johnson of Long Beach, Calif., and other members of the Service Wives Coordinating Committee of Los Angeles County and

surrounding areas for legislation to alleviate certain hardships incident to service of their husbands in the military forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Antinarcotic Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include a letter which I recently addressed to Capt. Edward Page Gaston, at his request, relative to H. R. 565, the bill which I have introduced in an effort to strengthen our laws with regard to traffic narcotics. I am also including the abridged comments some of my colleagues have directed to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to Mr. Gaston and to others interested in this subject. Mr. Gaston is national commander of the Patriot Guard, Inc., 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. This organization is actively engaged in a movement to suppress the distribution of harmful narcotics. Mr. Gaston has had a great deal of international experience, since he was formerly attached to the American Embassies in Germany and Mexico, and has had much to do with the United Nations.

Following are some statements commending him for services rendered:

General Eisenhower's commendation:

The Army will always be grateful for the splendid services you performed during the First World War for the American prisoners held by Germany, and I appreciate the opportunity to express our lasting appreciation.

Former President Hoover:

I have a fine recollection of our previous association.

The New York Times:

Captain Gaston's work in Germany and Belgium among the prison camps and battlefields will be long and gratefully remembered.

I recently wrote to my congressional colleagues as follows:

One of the grave criminal and moral problems facing our Nation is the astounding increase in the use of narcotics by our teenagers.

DOPE SALES TO SCHOOLCHILDREN

During the 82d Congress I introduced the first bill to try to correct this problem by imposing extremely severe penalties upon those individuals who peddled narcotics to teen-agers. I believe that the time is overdue for a full hearing by the Ways and Means Committee of this entire matter.

To another correspondent, I wrote:

We have been shocked during the past days by the news that narcotics are being sold to schoolchildren. There is no criminal so

despicable * * * the police department and the district attorney of New York would welcome this law.

Mr. REED of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, wrote:

My bill, H. R. 5561. * * * It is too early to predict what action will be taken on this measure, but I hope it will be favorable.

This bill is now law.

THE AMERICAN LEGION ACTS

Mr. PATTEN, of Arizona:

Two of the bills introduced by me were at the request of the national American Legion as a result of their rehabilitation conference here in Washington.

Mr. KING of California:

My office has received many letters and telegrams of encouragement from all over the Union in support of the antinarcotics bill I have introduced.

Mr. SHEPPARD, of California:

I am specifically interested in seeing that extreme, severe penalties are applied to those who peddle narcotics to our teenagers. They should receive the same type of treatment as one who commits the overt act of first-degree murder.

ALONG THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. MOSS, of California:

I am very much in favor of strong legislation to curb the narcotic traffic.

Mr. HIESTAND, of California:

There is great unanimity (in favor of the bill) except from a few of the legal experts, who agree in the principle involved of stiffening the punishment, but feel we may have overstepped the mark. * * * I think we will have to change the bill around.

Mr. HOSMER, of California:

The epidemic of narcotic addiction among teenagers, particularly in southern California, but in all the States along the Mexican border, is serious.

HEARTBROKEN PARENTS

Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

Request that these bills be set for prompt hearing.

Mr. LANTAFF, of Florida:

I have had a great deal of correspondence on this matter with many heartbroken, distracted parents of teen-agers who have fallen into the habit * * * which is rapidly causing the ruination of the lives of many of our youth.

Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida:

An attempt to secure passage of legislation which would severely penalize people who sell narcotics to teen-agers.

FIVE HUNDRED LETTERS FROM CHICAGO

Mr. McVEY, of Illinois:

I have had more than 500 letters from my district (Chicago) manifesting an intense interest in the passage of the measure which I have sponsored. * * * It is my hope that the good people * * * who are interested in getting a bill before the Congress will press

the Committee on Ways and Means for a hearing on the bill which I have proposed, or some other measure that will deal a decisive blow to this dreadful menace.

SELLERS LIABLE FOR DAMAGES

Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

No one is more opposed to the sale of narcotic drugs to the youth of the land than I am. * * * A part of that penalty should be that the seller should be held liable for any damage arising out of the use of the article sold.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky:

The subject is of great importance.

Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana:

Herewith copy of Public Law 255 of the 82d Congress which I sponsored.

This bill is now law.

Mr. SMALL, of Maryland:

I recommend that Federal hearings be held at the earliest practical date.

Mr. BENTLEY, of Michigan:

A full hearing * * * on the question of the use of narcotics by teen-agers and the matter of imposing penalties on those who peddle this despicable traffic.

Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota:

I am happy to write the Ways and Means Committee to urge a hearing on this legislation.

Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri:

I am in hearty accord with your avowed objectives. * * * I will certainly support it on the floor of the House.

Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri:

It demands the most thorough investigation.

UNSCRUPULOUS NARCOTICS PEDDLERS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

I am hopeful that the other States of the Nation who do not have law of this kind. * * * will use my bill as a pattern for effective legislation in their States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

I am particularly concerned about these unscrupulous individuals who live off peddling narcotics to teen-age children.

Mr. BELCHER, of Oklahoma:

It has been my thought for quite some time that penalties for these crimes shall be more severe; therefore I hope that you will explore the entire subject.

Mrs. KELLY of New York:

This is a grave matter which threatens to become more serious if legislation is not enacted to correct it immediately.

TO CORRECT THE GROWING MENACE

Mr. KEOGH, of New York:

Any steps that are taken to accomplish this objective are most worthwhile.

Mr. BUCKLEY, of New York:

Which would strengthen our laws * * * and correct this growing menace.